

Gerald B. Leighbody, of New York, to be area chief of training, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Buffalo area office.

Joseph H. Louchheim, of New York, to be principal administrative analyst, Office for Field Management, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Abe L. Savage, of New York, to be principal information specialist, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Frank B. Stillwell, of Ohio, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dayton area office.

#### IN THE ARMY

#### APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

##### To Ordnance Department

Maj. George Walter Vaughn  
Capt. Elmer Matthew Webb

##### To Cavalry

Lt. Col. James Brian Edmunds

##### To Coast Artillery

Capt. Jacob George Reynolds

##### To Air Corps

First Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer  
Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen  
Second Lt. Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr.  
Second Lt. James Moore Boyd  
Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle  
Second Lt. Robert Usher Gaines, Jr.  
Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr.  
Second Lt. Jay Jaynes  
Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis  
Second Lt. John Raymond Sands, Jr.  
Second Lt. Samuel Frederick Stebelton  
Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to the examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be colonels, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1943

Joseph Dogan Arthur, Jr.  
John Stewart Bragdon  
George Jacob Richards  
Lehman Wellington Miller  
Douglas Lafayette Weart  
Earl Ewart Gesler  
John French Conklin  
X William Frazer Tompkins  
X Douglas Hamilton Gillette  
Donald Angus Davison

To be colonel, Ordnance Department, with rank from June 12, 1943

X Henry Spliese Aurand

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Flynn G. Humphreys, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve (Chaplain Corps), offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the light of all the ends of the earth, who maketh the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice, hear our prayer and mercifully incline Thine ear to our petitions. Most merciful Father, who showest Thy children the path of life, in whose presence there is fullness of joy, and in whose right hand there is pleasure forever more, we thank Thee for Thy mercies, for the safety and rest of the night, for the hopes and duties of the day. Knowing Thee, we know all we need to know of the un-

known future, near or far away. May this day, then, be a day of holy peace and happiness in our land and in our hearts.

O Heavenly Father, in these dark days of trouble and disaster, turn our feet back to the tabernacles of the most high, the altars of the church, and the ways of godliness. Bless and guide, we pray Thee, these servants of Thine in the work of this day, that through them the people of the Nation may know the joy of serving Thee with one heart and one mind. In this hour we pray for leaders of the Allied Nations of the world, and especially for the youth of our land who are serving on the far-off battlefields of the nations of the earth. We pray for their comfort and safety; we pray that the sacrifice which they are making will not be in vain, because of our failure at home. Give peace, O God, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven, for the sake of our Saviour and Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JAMES J. MCENTEE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for permission to address the House to pay my tribute of appreciation to a man who has done a magnificent job for the youth of our Nation, Mr. James J. McEntee, the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Not only have I the privilege of knowing Mr. McEntee very well, personally, and working with him, but also I have the privilege of representing him in Congress. He is a resident of my district, the thirteenth, in New Jersey. Recently he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to give an account of his stewardship as head of the C. C. C. That organization was brought into being by the Labor Committee of the House and was one of the most efficiently run agencies of the Government. It has given thousands of boys a chance to become useful citizens who might otherwise not have had the opportunity and there are many thousands of them serving today in the armed forces of the United States, grateful for their chance to repay their Government for the opportunity they received under the guidance of the C. C. C.

Jim McEntee is a representative of one of the great labor organizations of the country, the American Federation of Labor, and worked up through the ranks of organized labor to a position of responsibility and trust. He used the utmost intelligence and, above all, understanding, in the discharge of his duties as Director of the C. C. C.

It is with pride and gratitude that I pay this tribute to a man whom we all respect and whose ability we all admire.

Thanks, Jim McEntee, for the grand job you have done.

#### CANADA, EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitation tendered by the Speaker of the Senate of Canada and joint-president of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dominion of Canada branch, to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, during the period June 26 to July 1, 1943, at which the Dominion of Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association will be host to a delegation from the United Kingdom Parliament and probably to delegations from the legislative bodies of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed \$1,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by the Governor of Georgia, Hon. Ellis Arnall, at the Governors' Conference yesterday at Columbus, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a statement from the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on the N. Y. A.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address which I delivered on War, Peace, and Aid. I learn today that the speech is a page longer than allowed and will cost \$135 extra. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent, in spite of the additional cost, to extend the address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, daily I am receiving letters from worried taxpayers back home asking how the new tax laws will affect them. This epidemic of headaches for taxpayers is spreading all over the country. I am answering my inquiries by sending this "aspirin" that cures these taxpayers' headaches. It is known as House document 237, entitled "The Current Tax Payment Act of 1943." I consider it the A, B, C of this new tax program, and I would say that it ought to be named Easy Steps for Taxpayers. It was prepared by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED.]

I have exhausted my supply of this "aspirin." I think the House should at least authorize 100,000 copies of it, in view of the fact that our bureaus have sent out complicated questionnaires that create headaches all over the country, and this document will at least allay worried taxpayers' headaches.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, 1934

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 254, authorizing the Librarian of Congress to deliver to the House Committee on the Library all materials deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I have no objection to the Attorney General's Office having access to these papers, but the Attorney General's Office made such a fiasco in its recent activities in Mississippi that I have not the confidence that I ought to have in the Attorney General's Office, and especially since that episode has probably contributed to the Nation-wide race troubles we are having today. These are secret papers. They contain information that was acquired by the Committee on Un-American Activities almost 10 years ago. I am not willing for these papers to get out of the jurisdiction of a committee of Congress unless a photostatic copy of every one of them is retained.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I feel that some care must be given to this question, just as does the gentleman from Mississippi, but if the gentleman will carefully read this resolution as it is proposed to be amended, these papers do not go to the Attorney General; these papers go to the Committee on the Library, and then if the Attorney General wishes to see them he may come up and see them in the presence of the Committee on the Library, or at least the committee can safeguard them. That is the object of it. I personally am not willing to take the responsibility of withholding these papers from the Attorney General at this time when some people who are likely affected by

these papers are on trial. I hope the gentleman will not object; I am not going to object. The Committee on the Library can permit any Member or committee of the House to inspect these papers and I have reasons to believe they will be reasonable in the exercise of this discretion.

Mr. RANKIN. I feel that if this will help the Attorney General's Office in the trial of these cases we should let him have them. Those cases should be tried now. I am not objecting to the Attorney General's having access to these papers, but I do not want these papers to get out of the hands of the Congress of the United States, because there is information in them, as I understand it, that is vitally necessary for the Congress to have access to in the future. I do not want to do anything that will delay the prosecution of these people who are under indictment. I do not care what these Communist newspapers say, I want these people brought to trial immediately, and if they are guilty they should be convicted and punished. I do not want to withhold any information that would aid the Department of Justice in that respect; but I certainly want to see that these papers are retained where the Congress will always have access to them.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I wish to inform the gentleman from Mississippi that when this resolution was originally drawn it provided that the papers were to be turned over to the Attorney General. The Committee on the Library saw fit to amend the original resolution so that the papers now will be kept in the custody of the Committee on the Library. This has been agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. So these papers will be retained by the Committee on the Library in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know nothing about what these papers contain, but I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that if there is anything in them that will aid the cause of justice, let the Attorney General have them; but why should not Members of Congress at least have access to the papers? The chances are that the papers contain a lot of hearsay; nevertheless, if they are to be made available to the Attorney General why not make them available to Members of Congress?

Mr. RANKIN. As soon as the Attorney General gets through with the prosecution of these cases I hope he will get busy prosecuting these Communists that are stirring up these zoot-suit riots and these race riots all over the country that are doing more harm than anything else except these unjustified strikes in our war industry. I hope the Attorney General will wake up to the fact that the Communists are stirring up race troubles from Detroit to El Paso.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to deliver to the Attorney General for such use as the Attorney General may deem appropriate, all material deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including the contents of a sealed package inscribed "House of Representatives, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1934. Hearings Confidential," the content of which package shall be returned to the Librarian of Congress after the Attorney General has made such use of the same as he has deemed appropriate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "The Attorney General" and insert "that committee."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library."

Page 1, line 13, strike out "he" and insert "it."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Hon. Paul V. McNutt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement made by Hon. Marvin Jones before the House Committee on Agriculture concerning the food conference held recently in Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LT. FLYNN HUMPHREYS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, our visiting chaplain this morning was Lt. Flynn Humphreys, chaplain in the Navy. Early in this war he expressed a desire to get into it. He obtained an appointment and gave up for the duration one



of the best pulpits in my home city of Huntsville, Ala., that of the Central Presbyterian Church. During the time he has been in the service he has seen much, as the ribbons which he wears on his breast indicate.

He has just returned from Attu. He was there during the taking of that rocky stronghold from the crafty Japanese. To talk with him about those operations is to know better how the Japs tenaciously held on and savagely fought to the death to the last man. It is to know better how long and how hard is the road ahead before we have won this war. He has been in action, ministering to the dying sons of ours. He has had them die in his arms unafraid and confident that their dying was worth while. To hear him tell of them is to remind us of the terrible responsibility resting on each one of us back here on the home front to see that that faith has not been misplaced and that their death has not been in vain.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD under an extension of my own remarks an address by the Honorable Chester Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times by Arthur Krock on June 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Missouri Senate in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Catholic magazine America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

#### THE CORN SHORTAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is another of the hundreds of protests I have received:

We supply egg and milk producers covering area 25 miles north and south, 10 miles east. Absolutely impossible secure corn; none on hand. Hundreds of feeders will have to do without. Relief must be given immediately. Posting this on billboard for them to read showing our efforts their behalf. It's up to you.

SOUTHSHAVEN FRUIT EXCHANGE,  
CORNELIUS BUS, Manager.

I passed the buck and replied as follows:

Your wire received. Corn shortage due to the President's New Deal policy and Agricultural Adjustment Agency program. If the poultry dies and the milk cows go to the slaughter house, it is the fault of the President's New Deal bureaucrats. Make your protest to them.

Mr. Speaker, I have done all I can to remedy the situation. I have protested many, many times. I am now as always ready to go along with those Members who wish to abolish these bureaus which are interfering with production so that we will be able to get poultry, beef, eggs, and the food we must have next winter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent editorial from the Norwich Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged report (H. Res. 270, Rept. No. 572), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in

order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2869, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriation for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) "making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$1,087,800: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of the secretaries, exclusive of temporary additional compensation, and exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall correspond with those of the assistant administrative grade (grade 7 of clerical, administrative and fiscal service): *Provided further*, That the annual basic compensation of the secretary to a circuit or district judge shall not (exclusive of temporary additional compensation) exceed \$3,200: *And provided further*,

That the salaries of law clerks shall correspond with those of the assistant professional grade"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 27, and 28.

EMMET O'NEAL,  
MICHAEL KIRWAN,  
JOE HENDRICKS,  
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,  
H. CARL ANDERSEN,  
WALTER C. PLOESER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
JOHN H. OVERTON,  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,  
FRANCIS MALONEY,  
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Nos. 1 to 19, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for employees and other items, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 21: Appropriates \$291,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$289,200, as proposed by the House, for Capitol Buildings.

No. 22: Appropriates \$306,955 for maintenance of the Senate Office Building and provides that the unexpended balance of \$7,300 for the same purpose shall continue available until June 30, 1944, as proposed by the Senate, instead of appropriating \$313,560, as proposed by the House.

No. 23: Appropriates \$2,570,280 for salaries of clerks of courts, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,542,900, as proposed by the House.

No. 24: Restores the provision of the House, proposed to be stricken out by the Senate, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the cost of maintaining the office of clerk in certain United States district courts.

No. 25: Appropriates \$1,087,800 for salaries of officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, instead of \$987,100, as proposed by the House, and \$1,137,100, as proposed by the Senate, strikes out the provision of the House relating to the salaries of secretaries and law clerks of district judges; and inserts the proposal of the Senate amended to eliminate the provision relating to retroactive salary increases.

No. 26: Appropriates \$391,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$390,000, as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses, United States courts.

#### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

No. 20, relating to \$100,000 for preliminary work in connection with preparation of a new edition of the United States Code. The House managers will recommend that the House insist on its disagreement.

No. 27, relating to the terms of court at Greenwood, S. C. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 28, correcting a section number. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

EMMET O'NEAL,  
MICHAEL KIRWAN,  
JOE HENDRICKS,  
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,  
H. CARL ANDERSEN,  
WALTER C. PLOESER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the statement speaks for itself. We bring back for a vote of the House three amendments in disagreement, which will be explained later. I do not believe there is much necessity for explaining the amendments which are covered in the statement of the managers on the part of the House because most of them are amendments to the Senate part of the bill. As you know, the House writes its own appropriation bill and the Senate practically always approves what we put in the bill for the House. We in turn pass the bill relating to Senate matters to the Senate, and have no hearings on the items nor do we question what they do with reference to their own appropriations.

I think there is nothing else in the report itself that needs further explanation except for the three amendments in disagreement, which will be considered later.

Does the gentleman from Indiana desire to make any statement on the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I believe not.

Mr. O'NEAL. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: On page 28, line 10, insert the following:

"For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code, including the correction of errors as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1541), \$100,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 20.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEOGH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 20 and concur therein.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEOGH. May I be advised as to the disposition of the time on this motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky has the floor and controls the time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I shall explain to the gentleman from New York what the chairman of the committee has in mind.

The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws [Mr. KEOGH], appeared before the subcommittee before this bill was presented to the House, asking for \$100,000 to be used in the preparation of a code. The details of that matter will be explained later. The committee did not put that item in the bill because, for one reason, in the opinion of the committee, the way it was drawn the appropriation was not authorized by law.

Later the gentleman from New York offered an amendment in the Committee of the Whole which was considering this bill and the amendment was adopted. When the amended bill was presented to the House for action a separate vote was demanded and, on a record vote, the amendment of the gentleman from New York was defeated.

The gentleman from New York went to the Senate, and I may say certainly with the knowledge of the chairman and possibly other members of the subcommittee, because all of us wanted to extend all the courtesies we could to a committee of the House and to the gentleman from New York. The Senate inserted an amendment authorizing this study and appropriating the money for that purpose.

I want to be very frank with the House and state that the chairman of the subcommittee was not opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I felt that the work has to be done some time and that it is a most important work. But due to the fact that the House had voted on a record vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, I stood with my committee, so we bring this amendment of the Senate back to the House with the recommendation that the House further insist on the House position.

Personally, I have very little to say on the matter because, frankly, at heart I feel that possibly it is just as well to do this now as to do it later. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is the gentleman who opposed the amendment and made the point of order which resulted in a record vote on it. It is my purpose, I may say to the gentleman from New York and to the gentleman from Minnesota, to try to divide the time which I control, the balance of the hour, fairly between the two sides, those who are for this proposition and those who are opposed to it. The center aisle has nothing to do with the allotment of the time. I shall be very glad to try to divide the time as equitably as I can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was before the House previously the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. O'NEAL] said at the outset of the debate:

We are not willing, as a committee, to put it in this bill. I think perhaps the committee members will vote against it, but we



believe the work is highly important. Its cost is \$100,000, and we wanted this Committee of the Whole to decide whether or not we would go ahead with this expenditure at this time.

The vote in the Committee of the Whole was 103 to 67 in favor of the amendment. After the bill was brought back to the House a separate vote was demanded and on a division the amendment carried 92 to 72. A point of order was then made that a quorum was not present and on a roll call vote the amendment was defeated—yeas 177, nays 184, not voting 73.

If the Congress does not feel that this work is satisfactorily done or that it is not of great advantage to the country, then the Congress can very easily and properly refuse any future appropriations for codifications of other branches of the law. However, all of you have seen the District of Columbia Code which was prepared for the first time in the history of this country as a completely annotated edition of the code. The Committee on Revision of the laws did that work at a cost of \$32,500. Anyone who has had occasion to refer to this code will undoubtedly agree that this work will be of great value to the country.

The last time the Judicial Code of this country was revised was in 1911. It was done under the direction of a temporary commission at a cost of approximately \$230,000. For years it has been generally agreed that codification of the various branches of the laws of the United States would be of great value to the bar and to individual citizens. For at least 25 years this has been practically the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, whether the House was controlled by the Democrats or Republicans. In respect to the present appropriation, every member of your present committee, both Republican and Democrat, are supporting it. Our opponents have been kind and generous enough to frankly admit that this work is important and necessary and would have lasting value. Their opposition is based on the premise that it should not be done in wartime. However, Napoleon found time to codify the laws during his military campaigns over Europe at a cost relatively greater in those times than would be the present cost to us. His codification of the laws has been one of his lasting contributions to civilization. I feel sure that this codification would also have a very lasting and permanent value and that if it is further delayed it may never be done. Also I feel that, with his experience in the codification of the District of Columbia Code and the United States Code, not one could be better fitted to be the chairman of the committee conducting this work than the able gentleman from New York.

One argument made against this amendment previously was that it would only be of benefit to members of the bar and the legal profession. Actually the opposite is more true. It would be of greatest advantage to the everyday average citizens of the United States. Most lawyers charge on the basis of the services rendered. Naturally one of the chief items in their bill is the amount of time which it is necessary for them to spend looking up the law on the subject. While

the laws are in the jumble which now exists, obviously the legal profession must spend more time and study in research and consequently render higher bills to their clients. In addition, it is extremely difficult at times for the judges who are trying the cases to find the proper reference in the statutes; and if they should make an error due to this cause, then an appeal is necessary and the client has to bear the cost of that. The savings which would result from codification would be directly reflected in lesser fees paid by clients to their lawyers. Furthermore, the average man would be able more easily to understand just what the statutory law on the subject was.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Latin proverb to the effect that "amid the clash of arms the law is silent." The law may be silent in parts of the known world today but it is very vocal in the United States of America. The proposal now is to grant this appropriation for the recodification of two titles of the United States Code Annotated, to wit, titles Nos. 18 and 28.

The first of these is embraced in three volumes which refers to the Criminal Code and criminal procedure. The second is embraced in the remaining nine volumes, which relate to the judiciary.

The first compilation of laws under the Committee on Revision of the Laws, constituted in 1868 under the rules of this House, was in 1873. It is a singular fact and rather a coincidence that these laws were enacted on the 22d day of June 1874, 69 years ago today.

Since that time there has been enacted the Judicial Code, the Criminal Code, and more recently we have had the passage of an act providing for the promulgation by the Supreme Court of new criminal court rules. I direct attention, first of all, to the fact that the Judicial Code embraced in these 9 volumes, since it was enacted, has been amended over 200 times. I cite that to show the necessity for bringing this code up to date.

With reference to the proposed criminal rules, may I state something to you since I have had the privilege and opportunity of examining these new rules? They are in a draft form and have been submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. You understand that these rules will be integrated as a part of the criminal law. Under the rules as presented there are nearly 313 pages, and they are printed in an appendix of 29 pages—of forms—there are 56 of these rules. There is a constant advance and growth in the development of law. It is not static, it is not stationary, and we must keep abreast of it by having the law current at all times, and the reason for that is perfectly simple. It must be readily accessible to the people who must use it, not only to the lawyers and the courts, but to all of the departments of government and to everyone who must deal with the Federal statutes.

I would like to give you the advantage of a set of figures which I dug up in the last few days. The credit for this must

be given to the Honorable Walter Chandler, a former Member of this House, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and, in my judgment, one of the ablest men ever serving here. I want to tell you now what he pointed out not only as a reason for a revision of these rules and laws but also the necessity for keeping abreast of them. First of all, he referred to those sections relating to the judiciary not expressly repealed which should be repealed or incorporated in the new Judicial Code, 88 sections of them; and, second, the provisions included in title 28, United States Code, which have been amended or superseded by later legislation found elsewhere in an existing compilation, some 17 sections. In other places there is no indication at all in the sections in question that they are affected by the last provision. Forty-four sections are involved in the third classification. Fourth, these provisions included in title 28, United States Code, which have been amended or superseded by later legislation not mentioned in an existing compilation, 14 sections in all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when this matter first came before the House it was through an attempt made to insert this amendment. It is now again before the House. This amendment calls for an expenditure of \$100,000 for preliminary work toward recodifying the laws. I do not know how much the whole job will cost. There has been no estimate furnished us as to how much it will cost. I think the evidence before our committee established that there had been negotiations entered into or discussions had with one or more law-book companies, and it was proposed to pay them \$85,000 to do, I presume, what we would term this "preliminary work" toward the recodification of these laws. When the matter was presented to the committee originally, the committee would not incorporate it in the bill. When the bill came on the floor of the House, the amendment was offered. It went to a roll call vote, and the House defeated the amendment. It seems to me that the action of the House at that time was wise. One of the reasons is that to me this is no time to attempt to recodify these laws. We have many rules, regulations, directives, and what-not which will expire at the expiration of the war or 6 months thereafter. We could not make an up-to-date codification of the laws at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the last Supreme Court decision in which it is held that the rules and regulations and orders and directives of men in the employ of the various departments are law, how can anyone codify the law? How is it possible? You cannot keep them up to date, because they come out daily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think that is the situation which con-

fronts us regularly, and will continue until this war is over. We are confronted with a proposition here, Mr. Speaker, where this matter has not been submitted to the Budget. It has not been recommended by the Budget, and has not been recommended by any department of the Government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman knows that this item was submitted to the Budget, but being an item for legislative estimate, the Budget Bureau makes no recommendation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I do not know about that, but I thank the gentleman. The Budget did not recommend it, as the gentleman says, because it is a legislative matter. I do not care what the reason is. The statement I made is correct. It has not been recommended by the Budget, it has not been recommended by the Department of Justice, by the courts, or by any other agency of the Government that I know of.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman knows, as a matter of policy, that the Bureau of the Budget makes no recommendation with respect to items for the legislative branch?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to mislead the House in attempting to imply that this item was the only one that the Bureau of the Budget made no recommendation upon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. No; I am not making that statement at all. I say it has not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, by the courts of this country, by the Department of Justice, or by any other agency of government. I admire the gentleman from New York in his great desire to accomplish a work. I think it would be in good hands if he did the work, but I do not think this is the time to do it. Every day we read statements in the papers from the Treasury Department that we must raise taxes in order to get money to carry on the war. They are asking the boys to spend their dimes to buy stamps to win the war; they are asking that we save manpower; and to do everything that can be done to help the boys across the water. Here we are asked to take \$100,000 at this time to make a preliminary work in connection with recodifying the laws, although we have been getting along very well without it. I think it was in 1929 that authority for recodification of laws was granted by an act of Congress, and we waited from 1929 until this year of national emergency to come here and say, "It is a must case; we must do it now." I think we would be much better off if we would wait until this emergency is over. It may be at that time there will be need for employing some manpower and this might well be used at that time. We should wait until things are stabilized and then we will have an opportunity to have this job done when it will be lasting and of benefit.

Now, there is one other matter I would like to speak of.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman in his remarks gave the indication to me that this was just to start some general preliminary work. Naturally, this will make a complete codification of two branches of the law. So that if nothing further is ever done, you will nevertheless have two completed items as a result of this codification. If they prove satisfactory, you can go on from there or not, as future Congresses see fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The amendment reads:

For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I cannot yield. The gentleman has much more time than I. In fact, I felt the gentleman from New York should have made his statement and given us a chance to reply instead of waiting. However, that is something that we have no control over.

There is one thing that I want to speak about. When this bill went to the other end of the Capitol many amendments were added. The House, in conformity with its usual practice, has receded, and receded, and receded. That is about all we know—to recede. This is the only amendment added in the Senate about which there is any real objection and about which any effort will be made to carry the bill back to conference. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that the House of Representatives, when it takes a stand, as it did in this case on a roll-call vote, should stand by the position it has taken. I am getting mighty tired of seeing legislation day after day and week after week go to the other side of the Capitol and there be materially changed in many, many ways, and then come back to the House, always with the House of Representatives receding. I think it is high time the House of Representatives stood up and asserted its rights on legislation, and when it takes a position it should stand by that position.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course the motion made by this committee is to further insist upon the position of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes. I appreciate that. I think the chairman of the subcommittee indicated to us that he favored the amendment that had been offered.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman's subcommittee wanted to be perfectly frank about the matter and did state that he thought it was probably as well to do it now as later, and has always taken that position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is right. The gentleman has done good work as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Speaking about the House receding, does not the gentleman think it is about time we called upon the Senate to take some action on the Smith bill and the Hobbs bill that we sent over there and they have pigeonholed for a year or two?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that this matter is one about which a lot of work has been done. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] for his industry as well as his ability. I understand that he was so industrious that he went around and secured some 29 or 39 letters from Members who were absent when the other vote was taken. He is such a fine gentleman that he almost disarms you before you could ever enter into any sort of discussion with him. I have the highest regard and respect for him. I admire him for the position he has taken. He took the position, as I understand, that he is chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws and if he does not get funds he is not going to be able to do anything in the next 2 years, and therefore we should keep him occupied and we should pass this amendment so that he will have something to do. I say I admire his industry. I admire his ability. He presented this matter in one of the finest ways in which any matter could be presented to any committee. I want to pay him the highest kind of compliment that it is possible to pay him. But after all, we are trying to legislate, not in the interest of an individual or to satisfy the desire of someone to do work, even though that work might be worth while.

We are trying to legislate here in the interest of the people of the United States and at this time, under the present emergency, with the condition we find ourselves in regarding finances, the need of money to carry on the war, and with the prospect of a great many more taxes, it seems that the House once having taken action on this matter should stand by the action heretofore taken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, as to the necessity for codification of the law, I would like the privilege of referring the House to just one out-of-date section of the code which reads as follows:

In all contracts made for service for the House of Representatives involving the employment of horses, the expenses of keeping such horses shall be covered by the contract; and no money appropriated for contingent or other expenses by the House of Representatives shall be expended for stables or forage.

That shows how antiquated some parts of the laws are.

The fact is that the American Law Institute at this time is preparing a re-statement of the laws of all the States of the United States; the fact is that I



was a member of a committee in Pennsylvania which recently completed a codification of the criminal laws of Pennsylvania; the fact is that in all the 16 legal systems of the world you will find that after many wars, the old and the new laws were codified; that is true with respect to the Napoleonic Code, the Hammurabi Code, and others, all came about as a result of a conflict.

If there is any time to have a codification, in my judgment, it is right now.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to take the opportunity to say that I have been associated with the gentleman on that same Committee in Pennsylvania, and I would like to pay tribute to the very constructive work he did in the codification of the laws and I know that he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to thank the gentleman. I will say that in Pennsylvania they are now working on a codification of the code of criminal procedure. Certainly there is no better time to start than the present.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, with my chairman's permission, I think this might be a very logical time for the gentleman who is offering the amendment to tell the House what it is all about. May I inquire if the gentleman from New York would like to explain to the House his amendment?

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman desire to yield time to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I desire that he take his own time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] 5 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to remain as impersonal and objective about this discussion as I can. We have just heard a general colloquy as to who should open and who should close, which really is not pertinent.

I presented the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and to concur in that amendment and the effect of supporting that motion will be to enable the Committee on Revision of Laws to undertake, for the first time since 1911, a substantive revision of the titles of the United States Code dealing with the Criminal Code, the Judicial Code, and the judiciary.

Mention has been made to the prior action taken by the House. Permit me to call attention to the fact that in the Committee of the Whole, on the consideration of this legislative appropriation bill, my amendment, similar to the one now before the House, was adopted by a vote of 103 to 67. When the Committee went back into the House and a demand for a separate vote on the amendment was made, the amendment was agreed to by a standing vote of 92 to 72. It was only on a point of order of no quorum, and an automatic roll call following, that the amendment was rejected by a vote of 177 to 184.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. In other words, those who heard the discussion voted in favor of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEOGH. I do not like to draw any conclusion with respect to that, because I am sure that everybody who voted on the roll call knew what he was doing. I think it is rather significant, however, to note the votes taken in the Committee of the Whole and in the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes; I shall be delighted to.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me the House probably would be more interested in finding out what the gentleman proposes to do if the \$100,000 is given to him than in the votes.

Mr. KEOGH. I appreciate the gentleman's asking me that question since it affords me the opportunity to tell the House our purpose and plans. I have gone before the committees of the House and of the other body upon the unanimous request and with the unanimous approval of our committee. We know, dealing as we have for the past 5½ years with an attempt to make understandable to the public at large the laws that are enacted here, the problems that face the public when they attempt to determine what the state of any particular section of the law is.

The policy of drafting legislation in the form of statutes at large, to my mind, is not befitting the greatest legislative body in the world and unless and until we erect a permanent framework within and around which all future new and amendatory legislation may be drafted, in code language, the country, the bench, the bar, and this House will not know the precise status of any law. The gentleman has asked me to tell you what we propose to do.

We propose to bring to this body for its final approval and enactment into positive law, a model judiciary code and criminal code, the kind of codes that this great body should present to the people of the greatest country and we propose to do it with this appropriation, the smallest amount that has been asked for any work of a similar kind. This body authorized the appointment of committees by the Supreme Court for the promulgation of rules of civil procedure and criminal procedure. Those committees have expended upwards of \$200,000. We permitted them to do that. What your Committee on the Revision of the Laws wants to do is to act as it should; we want to do the legislating for the country. We do not want the continuance of the policy of delegation of authority to legislate. Sure, it is a dry, it is a monotonous job, but it is one that is badly needed. The country has cried for it.

The question has been asked: Who wants this work? The gentleman, I am afraid, indicates a complete lack of knowledge of the situation, although I mean not to be discourteous to him, when he inquires as to who wants this work done. The American Bar Association for years has been advocating it; every

member of the Federal judiciary has been advocating it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. We propose to take every statute at large that has been enacted since the Revised Statutes were enacted in 1874; we propose to integrate those existing laws into a unified, intelligent, coordinated, criminal and judicial code. We propose to consider the effect upon existing law of every decision of every court in this country and we propose to integrate and correlate these rules of civil procedure and of criminal procedure. We propose to do that and we propose then to come back to this House for its approval of our work and we expect in that work to repeal expressly all obsolete, all inferentially repealed, and all redundant laws that are still on our books.

The gentleman has asked how we propose to do that. The committee has considered that and has considered it very carefully. Your Committee on the Revision of the Laws will always retain active supervision and control. That is what we propose to do, and that is my reply to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes; I shall be delighted to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. TABER. In connection with this work is it proposed to take the mass of Executive orders that result from any of the language that is involved in sections of the code that are gone over so that we may have a complete picture of what the law is so the House may proceed upon that if legislation is brought in?

Mr. KEOGH. Quite naturally we shall consider the effect of outstanding Executive orders on existing law, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the United States Code, by law, contains only those laws which are of a permanent nature, and generally Executive orders, as the gentleman well knows, are not permanent law; they have the effect of law only so long as they are in force.

Mr. TABER. But, if the gentleman will yield there, that depends upon the statute under which those Executive orders were issued and in a great many cases it is permanent law unless it is repealed or changed by subsequent action of the legislature or the Executive.

Mr. KEOGH. I will not go into that phase of it any further, but we propose—and finally—to bring before this body and in all probability it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—a model code by which and from which we shall have a permanent framework of laws and thereby the country will know what the laws are.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that the sum expended for revising and consolidating the laws of Massachusetts was

\$450,000, that there was appropriated for the State of Connecticut \$300,000, for the State of New Jersey \$600,000, and for the State of West Virginia \$300,000 for the same purpose?

Mr. KEOGH. My recollection is that the gentleman states the figures correctly.

May I close by saying that I am, of course, appreciative of all the fine things the gentleman from Indiana has said of me. I can return them to him in kind. I know very well he has given this matter careful consideration and I am sure the gentleman will not mind my saying that some of the points he has raised indicates that he has perhaps not given to this subject quite as much consideration as your standing Committee on the Revision of the Laws has. We have been charged by you to do this job; that is our responsibility and we are asking you to give us the means to discharge that responsibility. I hope the motion to reconsider and concur will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 last the House defeated on a roll call vote of 184 to 177 this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Nothing has occurred since that time, Mr. Speaker, to change my opinion that this item of \$100,000 should not be inserted into the Legislative and Judiciary appropriation bill.

I, personally, can well see Mr. KEOGH's desire for a substantive revision of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code, which titles deal with the Criminal Code, and criminal procedure and the Judicial Code and the judiciary.

We all recognize that this is a very worthwhile and necessary work, but, Mr. Speaker, there is much worthwhile and necessary work today that we must subordinate to the one thing that at all times we must hold before us, and that is, the winning of this greatest of all wars America today is engaged in.

Last April 8 I opposed this insertion of \$100,000 because it is nonessential expenditure at this time and it is not designed to aid in any way the war effort. We are not, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, justified in utilizing manpower at this time in a measure of this sort, however desirable, when that manpower is needed as it has never been needed before in all lines of industry and when by so doing we will be breaking faith with the people of the United States of America.

This is one of the numerous worthwhile projects that we will need to give employment to people following the successful outcome of the war. It is not the sort of project, Members of the House, that must be done today. There has been no proof given here by the author of this amendment in any way that can be construed that this work will be much harmed by laying it upon the shelf for the duration of the war.

Our subcommittee worked long, tedious hours to cut this bill down \$3,000,000 be-

low the last year's appropriation. Will you not aid us in preserving these savings and vote against the pending amendment which would add \$100,000 to the total of the bill?

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts in this case? On April 8 the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] offered an amendment which was defeated by the House on roll-call vote. This appropriation has to do mainly with a committee in the House of Representatives and I personally resent the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the other body has seen fit to do something that the House of Representatives never does, and that is to insert an amendment of this nature, already defeated by the House, and which should rightfully be considered as a portion of the section of the House bill dealing with appropriations for our own legislative department.

My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] possibly had every right to go over to the other body and persuade the gentlemen there on the corresponding subcommittees to insert this particular amendment after it had been here defeated. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have every right to stand up here today to explain to the House why, in my opinion, this amendment already defeated by the majority of this House, should not be permitted to be inserted into this bill.

First. The manpower situation is too serious in this great Nation of ours today, while we are fighting a war of survival, to allocate to any such proposal as this the services of possibly 40 or 50 able-bodied men, that the doing of this proposed work would in all probability entail.

Second. I believe the House should reserve unto itself the right to say, as it has previously declared in this case, whether or not certain provisions shall be inserted in the House section of the legislative and judiciary bill.

Third. We will need just such jobs as this to give employment immediately following the war.

Personally, I would be willing to vote twice the amount if necessary to do a good job at that time rather than to spend \$100,000 now at a time we cannot afford to waste manpower in what is definitely stated in the committee amendment here before us as for preliminary work only.

Fourth. Other gentlemen will bring out or have brought out here today the fact that numerous directives which have the force of law are being issued at this time so as to make practically impossible the proper recodification or revision of any titles of the Code.

Fifth. May I call your attention to the language on page 28. It states:

For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new addition to the United States Code, \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if it takes \$100,000 for the preliminary work in connection with this particular code, how are we to know how much it is to cost for the actual publication and such?

With all due respect for the gentleman from New York, for whom and his com-

mittee I have the utmost respect, I do not feel that this is the time, Mr. Speaker, to embark upon an expenditure for which we are asked to give \$100,000 simply for preliminary work.

At a time when we are faced with the prospect of not being able to produce enough food for this Nation of ours and for our soldiers abroad because of the shortage of manpower, I cannot agree to this particular amendment, small as it may appear to some, but representing to me as it does not so much the money involved but the manpower all along the line that it is going to take to do the job at this time. The one big thing today is to win the war. When that is accomplished I shall be glad to aid the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] in his worthy desire to recodify properly the laws of our country.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I was a little bit disappointed in the answers that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] made to me with reference to what they propose to do. He seemed to think that a question of that kind indicated ignorance. Of course, I realize the importance of a recodification of the laws, but I wanted to be sure that the gentleman from New York grasped the situation confronting him. When he finished answering the question with reference to the effect of these Executive orders and that sort of thing upon the statutes and what the statutes were, I have grave doubt as to whether he grasped what the situation was that is confronting him. I came here with an open mind, but his answers to me greatly disturb me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree entirely with the gentleman from New York that we cannot recodify these laws at this time, when almost every day there comes out a directive or an order from the executive department that has in itself the force of law.

Mr. TABER. All of those must be codified along with the laws in order to arrive at what the laws are.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from New York is entirely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we have gotten into considerable confusion and misstatements of the facts, though it has been done inadvertently. In the matter of economy, we have been penny wise and pound foolish. More time is being taken up by 531 Members of Congress trying to find out what the law is and what it was they have passed; trying to find out where the law and the numerous amendments are and what they mean. One hundred times more time is wasted in looking up the law in the various volumes and books than ever will be taken by those who will codify the Judicial Code and the Criminal Code. This codification is not only for the protection of the Members of Congress, or for their



convenience; it is for the protection and convenience of the American people. The American people have a right to know what the law is and where to find it.

The idea of always trying to hide behind, but not in the uniform, does not count here today, because, after all, the soldiers out there in the field are as much entitled to know what the law is and they are just as much interested in having it codified. We keep on passing laws, but neither we nor anyone else knows where to find them. We pass law upon law amending and modifying existing laws without end and no one knows what the law is unless he devotes months and even years to clear up the amendments. Surely under these conditions no person on this floor should object to codification. It is said that there is a great deal of confusion about the edicts and Executive orders. The Executive orders are not a part of the law. The law gives the Executive the right to make orders, but the orders must be made under the law, and if the law is codified, then you know where the Executive order comes from, how it fits into the law, and until you know that, you do not know what the law is or whether the Executive order is in keeping with the law. You do not know whether the edict or the Executive order is legal unless you know the law that authorizes it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just until I read an extract from a statement by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, at one time chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. It is to be found in the preface to the Code of Laws of the United States, under date of June 30, 1926, signed by Roy G. Fitzgerald, chairman, and reads as follows:

This Code is the official restatement in convenient form of the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, now scattered in 25 volumes—1. e., the Revised Statutes of 1878 and volumes 20 to 43, inclusive, of the Statutes at Large. No new law is enacted and no law repealed. It is *prima facie* the law. It is presumed to be the law. The presumption is rebuttable by production of prior unreported acts of Congress at variance with the Code.

That is an effective answer to the matter of the Executive orders.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Here we have a situation where we have the responsibility of codifying the laws of the country, the laws that we have and are making, and if my memory serves me correctly, my friend from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] says that we ought to be out there fighting the country's battles with our soldiers. I would like to know what the codification of the Judicial and Criminal Codes has to do with our boys and how it can possibly interfere with the war efforts. If that were so, then let us all adjourn and go over there, and let someone else codify the laws that we have made so that when we and the boys return we will find the job done and the laws codified once and for all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from North Dakota is one of the distinguished jurists in the House and I ask him the question whether anybody inside or outside of Congress can say what the law is.

Mr. LEMKE. You cannot say what it is unless it is codified. It is the only way to know whether an Executive order or edict is in keeping with the fundamental law as passed, and that is what this committee is trying to do, not only for you today, but for tomorrow and for the years that are to follow. Unless you do this we are wasting our time, and yet you say the work of our committee shall not be recognized.

There is no other committee in this House that has asked for less money than the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, of which I happen to be a member, and of which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEUGH] is the chairman, and I know of no other chairman who has worked so diligently and so hard to accomplish a real result.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman knows that the purpose under this is to completely codify two statutes, 18 and 28, and not to go into a general preliminary survey that would require a lot of money to get results from. In other words, when we get done we will have a complete unity as far as two branches of the law are concerned, and not just a lot of preliminary matters.

Mr. LEMKE. I am very glad that the gentleman called my attention to that. I assure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that he is mistaken. This is not a preliminary work, this is permanent, complete codification of two codes, the Judicial and the Criminal Codes, and when we get through with these two codes, we will come back here and ask for more money to go ahead and complete the codification of the entire laws of this Nation and get them codified and arranged so that you and I know what they are, and where they are, and that is the whole question here.

I say again, let us forget personal peevishness, let us forget that this appropriation was put in by the Senate after we had defeated it here in the House, first carrying it on a voice vote, then carrying it by a standing vote, and finally on a roll call where there were only 184 Members voted against it and 177 for it. It was never defeated by a majority vote of all the Members of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 85, noes 43.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 122, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—234

Anderson, Calif.	Hays	Outland
Anderson, N. Mex.	Heffernan	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Heldinger	Patton
Bell	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mo.	Hinshaw	Pfeifer
Bishop	Hobbs	Pittenger
Blackney	Hoch	Plumley
Bland	Holifield	Poage
Bloom	Horan	Pracht
Bolton	Howell	Price
Boykin	Hull	Priest
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	Rankin
Bryson	Jeffrey	Reed, Ill.
Buffett	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Jensen	Richards
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson	Robertson
Burdick	Luther A. Johnson	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Lyndon B. Johnson	Robson, Ky.
Camp	Judd	Rogers, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Kee	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Keefe	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Kefauver	Rohrbough
Chipfield	Kelley	Rolph
Church	Kennedy	Rowan
Coffee	Keogh	Sabath
Cole, Mo.	Kerr	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Sasser
Cooley	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Cooper	Kleberg	Scanlon
Cox	Klein	Schiff
Cravens	Kunkel	Schuetz
Crosser	LaFollette	Scott
Cullen	Lane	Shaffer
Curtis	Lanham	Sheppard
D'Alesandro	Larcade	Sikes
Davis	Lea	Slaughter
Dawson	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Day	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dewey	Lewis, Ohio	Smith, W. Va.
Dilweg	Luce	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Ludlow	Snyder
Disney	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Dondero	McCormack	Sparkman
Doughton	McGehee	Spence
Drewry	McGranery	Stanley
Eaton	McKenzie	Stevenson
Elliott	McMurray	Stewart
Ellison, Md.	McWilliams	Sullivan
Feighan	Madden	Summers, Tex.
Fellows	Mahon	Talbot
Fenton	Maloney	Talle
Fernandez	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Mansfield	Thomason
Fogarty	Mont	Tibbott
Folger	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Forand	Marcantonio	Troutman
Fulbright	Mason	Vincent, Ky.
Gale	May	Voorhis, Calif.
Gallagher	Merritt	Vursell
Gavin	Michener	Wadsworth
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Walter
Gibson	Miller, Mo.	Ward
Gillette	Miller, Pa.	Wasielewski
Gordon	Mills	Weaver
Gorski	Monkiewicz	Wells
Gossett	Morrison, La.	Welch
Graham	Mott	Wene
Granger	Murdock	West
Gregory	Murphy	Whelchel, Ga.
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	White
Hall	Myers	Whitten
Leonard W. Hancock	Norton	Wickersham
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Ill.	Winter
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harris, Va.	O'Connor	Woodrum, Va.
Hart	O'Konski	Wright
	O'Toole	Zimmerman

NAYS—122

Abernethy	Andersen	Andresen
Allen, La.	H. Carl	August H.

Angell	Gilchrist	Morrow
Arends	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Arnold	Gore	Mruk
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Grant, Ind.	Norman
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Norrell
Beckworth	Gwynne	Pace
Bender	Hagen	Phillips
Bonner	Hall	Ploeser
Brooks	Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Ramspeck
Burch, Va.	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Burgin	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Busbey	Hoeven	Rizley
Butler	Hoffman	Rockwell
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Holmes, Wash.	Russell
Carter	Hope	Schwabe
Case	Jennings	Short
Chapman	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Anton J.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Johnson,	Springer
Clevenger	Calvin D.	Stearns, N. H.
Colmer	Johnson, Ind.	Stefan
Compton	Johnson,	Stockman
Crawford	J. Leroy	Sumner, Ill.
Creal	Johnson, Ward	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Jones	Taber
Dirksen	Jonkman	Tarver
Domengeaux	Kean	Taylor
Durham	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
Dworschak	Knutson	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	Lambertson	Welchel, Ohio
Elmer	Landis	Whittington
Elston, Ohio	LeCompte	Wigglesworth
Engel	McCown	Willey
Fisher	McGregor	Wilson
Fulmer	McLean	Winstead
Gathings	McMillan	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Maas	Worley
Gifford	Martin, Mass.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Neal

## NOT VOTING—74

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Fay	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fish	Newsome
Barden	Fitzpatrick	Nichols
Barry	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Furlong	O'Hara
Beall	Gamble	O'Leary
Boren	Gavagan	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Powers
Brehm	Green	Ramey
Buckley	Gross	Randolph
Cannon, Fla.	Halleck	Rivers
Capozzoli	Hare	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Hartley	Sheridan
Cochran	Hébert	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	Jarman	Starnes, Ala.
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Stegall
Culkin	Kearney	Tolan
Curley	Kilburn	Treadway
Delaney	King	Van Zandt
Dickstein	LeFevre	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Lynch	Wheat
Ditter	Magnuson	Wolcott
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton, N. J.
Eberhart	Monroney	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

## General pairs:

Mr. Eberhart with Mr. Mundt.  
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.  
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.  
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Powers.  
 Mr. King with Mr. Ditter.  
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Beall.  
 Mr. Hare with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.  
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Kilburn.  
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Hartley.  
 Mr. Courtney with Mr. O'Brien of New York.  
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Gillie.  
 Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Douglas.  
 Mr. Curley with Mr. Ellsworth.  
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gamble.  
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Wolcott.  
 Mr. Ford with Mr. Ramey.  
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Andrews.  
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. LeFevre.  
 Mr. Lynch with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. Martin of Iowa.  
 Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Baldwin of New York.  
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Gross.  
 Mr. Furlong with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JONES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 65, line 1, insert: "Sec. 204. Terms of court at Greenwood, S. C.: Section 105 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'at Greenwood the first Mondays in February and November' in the third paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'at Greenwood the second Mondays in May and December.'"

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on this amendment, it is purely a matter of local interest to the people of South Carolina and that part of South Carolina, and I believe it does not merit very much discussion. Therefore I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Page 65, line 7, strike out "204" and insert "205."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a correction. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes on the conference report will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2714), making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5; insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 60 and 61, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, has the gentleman discussed this with the ranking minority member?

Mr. TABER. I shall not object at this time to the bill going to conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which one of these is the Rural Electrification matter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That does not come in this bill. This is the urgent deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report an original privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 237, Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 53,000 additional copies of House Document No. 237, Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to Public Law No. 68, "An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes," approved June 9, 1943, of which 45,000 shall be for the use of the House Document Room, 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate Document Room, 2,000 copies for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CANADA, EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2481), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 8, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 53, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 74, 75, 101, 102, 108, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 23, 24, 50, 54, 68, 77, 89, 90, 95, 96, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 115; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert the following "\$1,498,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,898,184"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "Provided That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed \$9,100 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$658,843"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,127,236"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,481,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,826,649"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$149,595"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,787,376"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$282,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$350,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$223,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$165,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$113,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,767,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$257,128"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$822,629"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$472,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$169,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$416,131"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,978,537"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$940,280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,531,897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

#### "FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION"

"To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed \$496,011) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed \$83,700) and 5 (not to exceed \$65,100), of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567-568), and Acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed \$101,357; in all, not to exceed \$746,168, of which not to exceed \$44,110 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed \$30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery

stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24,678,065"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 147, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,675,136"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,069,391"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum of \$1,278,649 where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$177,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$364,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
ELMER H. WENE,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CALL HAYDEN,  
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,  
GERALD P. NYE,  
CHAS. L. McNARY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### CORRECTION OF TOTALS, ALLOCATIONS, ETC.

The following amendments are in adjustment of totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.: Nos. 2, 4, 6, 9, 16, 17, 24, 40, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 76, 77, 83, 96, 104, and 105.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,498,184, instead of \$1,473,184 as proposed by the House and \$1,528,184 as proposed by the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$1,679,105 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,704,105 as proposed by the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

Amendment No. 5, administrative expenses: Appropriates \$439,257 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$488,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, regional and State field offices: Restores the language of the House, stricken out by the Senate, prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, with an amendment permitting the use of not to exceed \$9,100 for maintenance of the radio office at San Francisco.

Amendment No. 8, Yearbook of Agriculture: Appropriates \$178,000, as proposed by both the House and the Senate, but retains the House language. The amount appropriated is the amount estimated to cover the cost of binding in cloth and to provide a quota of 400 copies for each member of the House and 550 copies for each Member of the Senate.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 11, Puerto Rico: Appropriates \$140,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13, Administration and coordination of extension work: Appropriates \$658,843, instead of \$638,843 as proposed by the House and \$688,843 as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 15, Economic investigations: Appropriates \$2,127,236, instead of \$2,077,236 as proposed by the House and \$2,177,236 as proposed by the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 23, Insular experiment stations: Appropriates \$83,292 as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 27, cereal crops and diseases: Appropriates \$547,070 as proposed by the House, instead of \$575,860 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28, cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: Appropriates \$422,940 as proposed by the House, instead of \$445,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29, drug and related plants: Appropriates \$62,250 as proposed by the House, instead of \$65,530 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30, forage crops and diseases: Appropriates \$292,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$357,370 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31, forest pathology: Appropriates \$239,100 as proposed by the House, instead of \$256,945 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Appropriates \$1,361,828 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,428,249 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33, irrigation agriculture: Appropriates \$134,900 as proposed by the House, instead of \$142,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: Appropriates \$286,160 as proposed by the House instead of \$301,223 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35, Plant Industry Experiment Farm: Appropriates \$48,550 as proposed by the House, instead of \$51,109 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, soil and fertilizer investigations: Appropriates \$320,130 as proposed by the House, instead of \$336,976 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37, soil survey: Appropriates \$149,595, instead of \$49,595 as proposed by the House and \$205,430 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38, sugar plant investigations: Appropriates \$350,340 as proposed by the House, instead of \$368,780 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39, tobacco investigations: Appropriates \$120,520 as proposed by the House, instead of \$126,860 as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 41, fruit insects: Appropriates \$399,130 as proposed by the House, instead of \$404,130 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, gypsy and brown-tail moth control: Appropriates \$350,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$363,060 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44, Dutch elm disease eradication: Restores House language, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the enactment of laws by the States in which the appropriation is to be expended, requiring owners of property to remove diseased trees without expense to the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 45, forest insects: Appropriates \$150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$199,680 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46, truck crop and garden insects: Appropriates \$282,340, instead of



\$232,340 as proposed by the House and \$323,520 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47, cereal and forage insects: Appropriates \$350,170, instead of \$330,170 as proposed by the House and \$330,170 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction under the Senate figure will eliminate the proposed increase of \$30,000 for work on the European corn borer.

Amendment No. 48, barberry eradication: Appropriates \$233,250, instead of \$173,250 as proposed by the House and \$423,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49, cotton insects: Appropriates \$140,730 as proposed by the House, instead of \$148,139 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50, pink bollworm and *Thurberia weevil* control: Appropriates \$637,460 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House. The appropriation agreed upon restores the House cut below the Budget \$57,460 and also provides the supplemental Budget estimate of \$180,000.

Amendment No. 51, insects affecting man and animals: Appropriates \$165,940, instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House and \$174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52, insect-pest survey and identification: Appropriates \$130,000, instead of \$125,000 as proposed by the House and \$140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53, foreign parasites: Appropriates \$19,740 as proposed by the House, instead of \$20,775 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54, control investigations: Appropriates \$66,585 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55, insecticides and fungicide investigations: Appropriates \$113,820, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$119,815 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58, agricultural engineering investigations: Appropriates \$257,128, instead of \$217,128 as proposed by the House and \$297,504 as proposed by the Senate. The entire amount of the increase over the House figure is to be applied to farm structures as related to potatoes and other war crops.

#### BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 62, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$416,131, instead of \$366,131 as proposed by the House and \$508,781 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$50,000 above the House figure is toward the supplemental Budget estimate of \$250,000 and provides in full for the project of \$42,650 for development of equipment and methods for home food preservation under wartime conditions. The remainder of the increase is allocable to other projects under the supplemental estimate, within the discretion of the Department.

#### WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,946,342 as proposed by the Senate.

#### FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 67, national forest protection and management: Appropriates \$14,978,537, instead of \$12,826,826 as proposed by the House and \$15,393,537 as proposed by the Senate. This provides an increase of \$2,151,711 for emergency forest fire control, and disallows the Senate increase of \$415,000 for forest plantation care.

Amendment No. 68, farm and other private forestry cooperation: Strikes out this item, as proposed by the Senate, which is re-inserted elsewhere in the bill under Senate amendment No. 82 (which see).

Amendment No. 69, forest management: Appropriates \$400,000, instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House and \$542,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70, range investigations: Appropriates \$250,000, instead of \$150,000 as

proposed by the House and \$267,200 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$100,000 over the House figure is for the additional work in Louisiana and the continuance of work in the Southeast, proposed under the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 71, forest products: Appropriates \$940,280, instead of \$800,000 as proposed by the House and \$989,765 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72, forest products: Eliminates the language, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the use of \$30,000 of the appropriation for the purchase of land adjacent to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 73, forest survey: Appropriates \$140,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$199,363 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74, forest economics: Appropriates \$75,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$118,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75, forest influences: Appropriates \$75,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$132,600 as proposed by the Senate.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 85, sale of Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at not less than parity prices: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the House language unqualifiedly prohibiting the sale of Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price and substitutes therefor the Senate language with certain amendments prohibiting, with various and sundry exceptions, the sale of such commodities below parity or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941. (See this item in the body of the report, ante.)

#### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 89, limitation to \$500 of payments to any one person or corporation: Accepts the Senate action in striking this limitation from the bill.

Amendment No. 90, limitation of administrative expenses to 50 per centum of the amount so expended under the Act for 1943: Accepts the Senate action in striking this provision from the bill.

Amendment No. 91, prohibition against State or county information employees: Restores this provision, stricken out by the Senate, amended so as to permit the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers.

#### PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$170,281,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$193,623,000 as proposed by the House.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 101, general administrative expenses: Appropriates \$401,315 as proposed by the House, instead of \$451,315 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102, soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: Appropriates \$1,071,573 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,196,573 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103, soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates \$19,130,000, instead of \$17,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMI-ARID AREAS

Amendment No. 106: Retains the item, inserted by the Senate, amended to appropriate \$1,000,000, instead of \$1,278,649 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION

Amendment No. 108: Strikes out the item, inserted by the Senate, appropriating \$150,000 for the Consumers' Counsel Division.

#### MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 109, market news service: Appropriates \$1,084,570 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,141,655 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110, market inspection of farm products: Appropriates \$474,137 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$450,430 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111, marketing farm products: Appropriates \$388,250 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$363,250 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 112, 113, and 114, Standard Container Acts: Authorizes the carrying out of the Standard Container Acts, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$10,000 therefor, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115, Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts: Appropriates \$1,042,428 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$992,428 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117, Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates \$364,070, instead of \$350,000 as proposed by the House and \$378,140 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 119, Commodity Exchange Act: Appropriates \$300,000, instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House and \$325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference failed to reach any agreement as to the following amendments:

*Totals, Allocations, Corrections of Text, Etc.*

The following amendments relate to totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.: Nos. 12, 14, 19, 22, 25, 79, 80, 120, 121, 123, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 10: The House appropriated \$300,000 to carry out the Act of April 24, 1939. The Senate struck out the House language and appropriated \$555,000 for additional cooperative extension work for allotment to the States and Territories within the discretion of the Secretary. The purpose of the appropriation is to prevent the loss to any State of funds on account of census changes. The conferees agreed upon the Senate language, but it is brought back in disagreement because it contravenes legislative authority. It is the purpose of the managers on the part of the House to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. In agreeing upon this action the conferees of both bodies agreed that they would not hereafter support this item unless substantive legislation has been enacted authorizing it, and are suggesting to the legislative committees of the respective bodies having jurisdiction of the subject matter that they report suitable legislation to the two Houses for the purpose of ascertaining the will of the Congress respecting the continuance of this appropriation.

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 18, salary of Chief of Bureau: Authorizes the salary of the Chief of the Bureau at \$10,000 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 20, salary of Administrator: Authorizes the salary of the Administrator at \$9,200 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment No. 21, Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates \$2,463,708, instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House, and

authorizes the use of \$63,708 of the amount for allotment during the fiscal year 1944, the same as in 1943, to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population. The House managers will move to recede and concur. The conferees agreed that they would not recommend this item another year, unless it has been authorized by law, and the same suggestion is made to the appropriate legislative committees as in the case of amendment No. 10, under the Extension Service.

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 26, diseases of animals: Authorizes the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Md. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### FOREST SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 78 and 81, forest fire cooperation: Appropriates \$6,300,000, instead of \$2,492,210 as proposed by the House, and authorizes the use of \$2,300,000 without matching by States or private owners for preventing and suppressing fires on critical areas of national importance. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for the War Food Administration and authorizes the payment of the salary of the Administrator at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment making the provisions of law relating to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, under which salaries not in excess of \$10,000 may be paid, applicable to appointments under the War Food Administration.

#### CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$400,000,000, instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87: Strikes out the House language limiting the appropriation to payments "for compliances with soil-building practices and water conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended" and inserts language making the appropriation available "for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended", etc.

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes the House provision prohibiting incentive payments.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building.

Amendment No. 93, purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, etc.: Inserts the provision heretofore carried in the bill and stricken out in the House on a point of order, authorizing the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, etc., for advancement to farmers to enable them to comply with the program. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 94, payments to tenants and sharecroppers on Government-owned lands: Authorizes payments to tenants and sharecroppers on Government-owned lands who comply with the program. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 97, parity payments for crop years 1943 and 1944: Inserts a provision authorizing the Secretary to make commitments for parity payments on the 1943 and 1944 crops.

#### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Amendments Nos. 98 and 99, Federal crop insurance: Appropriates \$7,818,748, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House language providing for liquidation of the corporation.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 100: Inserts language, stricken out in the House on a point of order, enabling the Soil Conservation Service to place its warehousing facilities at the disposal of other Federal agencies in the field. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 107, exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities: House managers will move to accept the language of the Senate, amended by striking out the word "expansion" and adding at the end of said language the following: "but no part of such funds shall be available to defray the expenses of any activity heretofore carried on by the Work Projects Administration." This amendment authorizes the use of \$50,000,000 of the so-called "30 percent fund" for the maintenance and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. The House and Senate conferees are in agreement with respect to this authorization that (1) they will not favor the renewal of this authorization next year unless the same is specifically authorized by substantive legislation; (2) under the proposed language, the Department is to have administrative discretion respecting the expenditure of the school milk and lunch fund, including the allocation of said fund to the several cities or communities in which the same is to be expended; and (3) the use of the fund to enable the distribution of milk to relief clients other than school children in connection with the school milk and lunch program, at less than market prices, as shown by the House hearings to be currently in effect in New York City and certain other cities, is to be discontinued.

#### MARKETING SERVICE

Amendment No. 116, United States Warehouse Act: Appropriates \$464,115, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 118, Packers and Stockyards Act: Inserts language, stricken out in the House on a point of order, authorizing the bonding of market agencies and dealers. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 122, loans: Appropriates \$30,000,000, instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 124, examination of Federal land banks and joint stock land banks: Authorizes such examinations once per annum instead of twice yearly and provides for the assessment in advance of banks so examined to cover the cost thereof. This provision was stricken out in the House on a point of order. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

#### FARM TENANCY

Amendments Nos. 125 and 127, farm tenancy: Strikes out the House provision appropriating \$500,000 for administrative expenses and inserts it on a subsequent page (see amendment No. 127) with an appropriation of \$1,326,070, together with an authorization of \$30,000,000 for loans out of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds.

#### LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 126: Inserts new language appropriating \$29,607,573 for administrative expenses and authorizing loans from Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds in the amount of \$97,500,000.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the House, prohibiting loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 134: Inserts language providing that on farms on which the substantial portion of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or insect infestation, cotton may be planted, produced, and marketed without regard to present marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and without causing the producer to be subject to deductions or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support.

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
ELMER H. WENE,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,  
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted 134 amendments to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill as it passed the House. As you will observe from the conference report, the Senate has receded on 33 of those amendments. The House has receded on 18, and in connection with a large number of other amendments where the House, if it adopts the report of the conferees, will recede with amendments, the Senate has made substantial concessions to the viewpoint of the House.

There are a number of very important amendments that are still in disagreement. However, not so considerable a number as we at one time anticipated might be true. They aggregate some four or five or possibly six amendments. I do not intend to discuss all of the items included in the conference report, but I do wish to make particular reference to some three or four of the outstanding matters in which I conceive the House is especially interested, and I shall then undertake to answer as best I can any questions that Members may desire to address to me.

With regard to the appropriations provided by the Senate version of the bill for forest-fire protection, both on national forest domains and in the cooperative fire-protection work and on critical areas where the emergent need for such protection may develop, the House conferees have agreed to the Senate position insofar as we could. What I mean by that is, insofar as the appropriations for forest protection and management is concerned, where the amount provided by the Senate was authorized by law, we have included the amount requested by the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. In just a moment I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

In connection with forest fire cooperative work, where the limitation of the authorization is \$2,500,000, and where the proposed Senate amendment of \$2,300,000 for use in critical areas is not authorized by law and where the Senate



has exceeded for the cooperative fire protective work the amount of the authorization by \$1,500,000, the subject matter could not be included in the conference report, but the House conferees will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. During the consideration of the appropriation bill for the War Department Saturday afternoon we were assured that the conferees were agreeing to place in the agricultural bill the same amounts, as I understand it, that we were asked to deduct from the War Department appropriation bill at that time.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the Chairman of the full Committee, and myself gave that assurance to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the subcommittee, and the \$2,760,000 carried in the War Department bill would have been duplicated in this bill unless what was in the War Department bill might have been removed therefrom by an amendment, and that, as I understand it, was satisfactory to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. CASE. That was done. The purpose of my inquiry was to determine whether the same amount was included in this bill.

Mr. TARVER. That is the information we had. The clerk of the full committee made an investigation of the subject matter and gave us that information. Of course, it is not the desire of the Congress to make the same appropriation twice, once in the agricultural bill and once in the other bill.

Mr. CASE. The reason I ask the question is that on page 12 of the conference report, as I read the first amendment, No. 67, under "Forest Service," it states:

This provides an increase of \$2,151,711 for emergency forest fire control.

As I recall the amount the reduction determined upon was about that sum.

Mr. TARVER. \$2,760,000, but the gentleman will recall that \$2,300,000 is included in a later portion of the bill for use in critical areas.

Mr. CASE. That is all right; I wanted to have a record of it.

Mr. TARVER. I shall direct particular attention to the action taken by the conferees in connection with amendment No. 85, relating to the use of administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the disposition of Government-owned or Government-controlled agricultural products at less than parity prices. That is a subject matter upon which we have considerable debate and disagreement with the Senate in prior years. We have agreed with the Senate conferees, subject, of course, to the approval of the House, upon the modifying language which you will find set out in the report of the managers on the part of the House. That language is more restricted in the exceptions to the general rule than was the language carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. This language

will permit exceptions in cases of five different types:

First, agricultural commodities which have deteriorated; second, grains sold for the purpose of feed; third, grain sold to the farmers for seeding purposes; fourth, any agricultural commodities which are used for experimental purposes in new or byproduct uses; and fifth, the sales which are permitted of peanuts at less than the peanut parity price for use in the manufacture of oil.

The language of the Senate defining the initial inhibitions against the use of Commodity Credit Corporation administrative funds for the purpose of sales of agricultural commodities at less than parity, before exceptions were stated, has been agreed to rather than the language carried in the House bill, but that portion of the Senate amendment, in the judgment of the House conferees, does not differ materially from the language the House provided.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. As I read this language it would appear that there is nothing in this that in any way conflicts with the present legislation governing the sale of wheat for feed. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TARVER. That, I think, is correct. However, I call the gentleman's attention to the concluding language of the provision, which reads:

*Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat, the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn.

Mr. HOPE. That language is substantially the same language.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. That language is substantially the same language which is included in the last two pieces of legislation providing for the sale of wheat?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I think that is true.

As I said awhile ago, I think with the exceptions provided in the amendment as reported in the conference report, the language will be more restricted from the standpoint of the sale of agricultural commodities by the C. C. C. than was the language included in the bill for the present fiscal year.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. This would be true, however, that this places no limitation on the amount that might be sold for feed and it would not be necessary hereafter for the Commodity Credit Corporation to secure any additional legislation.

Mr. TARVER. Provided the amount sold for feed complies with the restriction with reference to the price at which it should be sold: Wheat at not less than corn parity and corn, of course, at not less than corn parity.

Mr. PACE. But with no limitation on the amount itself.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly. There are a great many items in the report to which it is probably unnecessary to refer, but there are three errata in the statement of the managers on the part of the House that I think it desirable to call attention to for the purpose of having the record speak the truth.

Amendment No. 23: Insular experiment stations. The statement is made in the statement of the managers on the part of the House that it appropriates \$83,292 as proposed by the House instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate. It will be observed that in the conference report it is stated that the House receded from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 23 and, of course, the report controls. The statement in the statement of the managers to the effect that the Senate receded is an incorrect statement and the total amount appropriated, if the conference report is agreed to, will be \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

In connection with amendment No. 70, range investigations, I quote the language from the report of the managers which is also in one particular incorrect—

Appropriates \$250,000 instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House and \$267,200 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$100,000 over the House figure is for the additional work in Louisiana and the continuation of work in the Southeast proposed under the Senate amendment.

The statement is incorrect in that it states that the entire increase of \$100,000 is for the two purposes named. As a matter of fact, \$12,500 is for the work in Louisiana, and \$20,450 is for the work in the Southeast; and not all of the \$100,000 was intended for those two activities. I wish to make one other correction in the report of the managers.

I call your attention to amendment No. 128 relative to a limitation applicable to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. It is stated that the House managers will move to recede and concur. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment and will not submit the motion which it is stated in the report of the managers as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be submitted.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I care to say unless Members desire to ask questions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This question of funds for rural electrification will come up in a separate amendment, will it?

Mr. TARVER. That amendment is in disagreement and it is not included in the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I did not understand the statement with reference to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. I stated that the statement in the statement of the managers

as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that the managers would move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment is incorrect. The managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will be discussed at a later time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we have made as much progress in so short a space of time as we have, comparable to the difficulties we had with this bill last year. Members may recall that it was 9 days after the end of the fiscal year before we finally completed action on the agricultural appropriation bill.

We have had three sessions with the Senate. They have been in a reasonably agreeable mood, and the House went there also in the same kind of felicitous frame of mind; so we have made considerable progress in discussing most of the 134 amendments.

I may say with relation to farm security, about which there has been considerable question, that at a proper place in the proceedings the chairman of the subcommittee will offer an amendment dealing with farm security and farm tenancy which represents a compromise which I think will be agreeable to the House and which I believe will finally find acceptance with the Senate.

I wish to take just a moment to pay tribute to the clerk of this subcommittee, Arthur Orr. When we finished our conference yesterday afternoon at 4:15, it then became his responsibility to get busy and prepare this conference report and the statement of the managers. He labored incessantly, and I think he left this Capitol this morning at 2:30. It is a tremendous strain upon the clerks of the Appropriations Committee as we come into these final days of the fiscal year, and so here and now I want to pay testimony to the diligence, to the fealty, and to the faithfulness of the clerk of this committee and the clerk of the other committees. I ask you all to join with me in giving Arthur Orr a great big resounding hand of applause.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time than necessary to say that I think this whole House ought to appreciate not only the work of the clerk of the committee, who has been faithful, arduous, and indefatigable, but also the very fine and excellent generalship of our genial chairman of the subcommittee, a great parliamentary strategist, who has succeeded in bringing to the House at this time out of chaos, a bill so well drawn as it is to meet and to satisfy all of the pressure which has been brought to bear on us from so many sides, to which we have acceded, admit-

tedly, to some extent, resented and resisted as vigorously on the other, in order to compromise and to try to bring you a good bill, as we have done. We have worked as a nonpartisan group. It is probably too much to ask you to do the same or as much or as well.

We have tried to save money for the people and to make money for them. It will be easy to go the way of subsidies, but you want to remember we have repudiated that principle. The people pay the bills. Subsidies are indefensible sops.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 13, line 18, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$555,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, and 21 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 15, line 5, strike out "\$13,903,950" and insert "\$14,238,950."

Amendment No. 14: Page 15, line 24, strike out "\$14,542,793" and insert "\$14,927,793."

Amendment No. 21: Page 23, line 2, strike out "\$2,400,000" and insert "\$2,463,708."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 10, 12, 14, and 21.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments have to do with a subject matter upon which the House has apparently fixed its policy during prior years.

Amendment numbered 10 relates to an appropriation of \$555,000 for the Extension Service to prevent certain States from losing any of the funds that they otherwise would have received on account of shifts in farm population.

Amendment numbered 21 relates to the same subject matter, affecting the appropriation for the Office of Experimental Stations. There is in the last-mentioned amendment the sum of \$63,708.

Our subcommittee during prior years has indicated that in its opinion these appropriations which are not authorized by law should not be made and we have on some two or three occasions undertaken to resist agreeing to the Senate amendments; but the House has always finally agreed to the Senate amendments including these amounts in the agricultural appropriation bill, so your con-

ferees have felt that this procedure is in accordance with the will of the House and that we as servants of the House should submit the motion to recede and concur in those amendments.

Amendments numbered 12 and 14 have reference to totals only affected by the action taken on the other two items. You will note, however, in the conference report, and I trust that this will meet with the approval of the House, that we have indicated our desire that if these appropriations which are extra legal are to be continued, the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate should report for the consideration of their respective bodies legislation which will authorize them and that the conferees feel that these appropriations ought not to be made next year unless prior to next year the Congress shall have passed legislation making them in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are in the very unhappy position of operating under a law providing that these funds be apportioned for extension and experimental work; then we come along and torpedo and ignore absolutely our own legislation. That is not the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture and something ought to be done before we go to work on the 1945 appropriation bill some time after the turn of the year.

Mr. TARVER. I am in absolute accord with what the gentleman says.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to be generally agreed and conceded that the gentleman's committee should not come here with legislation next year unless he has statutory authority to do so. Year after year your committee has been coming before the Rules Committee and asking for a special rule to waive all rules of the House in order that you might violate the rules of the House. Year after year the same suggestion has been made.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I have heard that speech many times. May I say that the gentleman without objection on his part, so far as I am advised, participated in the action of the Rules Committee in reporting a rule on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill which made in order \$200,000,000 worth of appropriations not authorized by law, that your committee has reported to the House rules for the consideration of numerous other appropriation bills including provisions which were not authorized by law and, so far as I know, you have not refused a rule for the consideration of any appropriation bill except the Agricultural appropriation bill when that rule was requested.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is the worst offender.

Mr. TARVER. I do not care to hear the usual speech made by the gentleman in extenuation of his indefensible actions.



Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Clerk that certain changes will have to be made in the amounts of the two amendments affecting the totals in 12 and 14. So I ask unanimous consent to withdraw those two amendments from the request that I have made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman wants to make one of his witty speeches—

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question in order that the House may, if it sees fit, agree to amendments numbered 10 and 21 and reject amendments numbered 12 and 14 which are incorrect. I ask that the House take that action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendments numbered 10 and 21 and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer substitute motions with regard to amendments numbered 12 and 14 which are on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be privileged to withdraw his motion.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion which was formerly made with reference to amendments 12 and 14 and submit other amendments stating the correct amounts of the totals, which are on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MICHENER. I object to that, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman asked to withdraw a motion, and he can do that only by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that in the House a motion may be withdrawn as a matter of right.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,198,950."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,857,793."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: On page 18, line 11, after the comma, insert "including the salary of the Chief of Bureau at \$10,000 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: On page 19, line 19, strike out "\$24,282,186" and insert "\$24,798,443."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$24,623,443: *Provided*, That the appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: *Provided further*, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is a provision such as we have included in the last several supply bills passed, in order to take care of the situation if the final enactment should not be completed before July 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: On page 19, line 24, after "Administrator" insert "including the salary of the Administrator at \$9,200 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: On page 23, line 10, strike out "\$6,937,500" and insert "\$7,001,208."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 24, line 15, strike out "\$7,176,802" and insert "\$7,257,218."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, that is a total. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: On page 26, line 13, after the comma insert "including the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Maryland."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 78: On page 61, line 22, strike out "\$2,492,210" and insert "\$6,300,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter to which I referred in undertaking to present the conference report to the House. It is the increase in the amount made available for forest-fire cooperation, and also in connection with the appropriation of \$2,300,000 not carried in the House bill for forest-fire protection in critical areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: On page 61, line 23, strike out "\$72,418" and insert "\$87,418."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 80 and 81 be also read and considered together with amendment No. 79, as they all relate to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the other amendments mentioned.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 80: On page 61, line 23, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$5,000."

Amendment No. 81: On page 62, line 1, after "Columbia" insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize expenditures not to exceed \$2,300,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments numbered 79, 80, and 81.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 65, line 22, insert:

"WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, including not to exceed \$10,000 per annum for an Administrator; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed \$50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing, and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedules."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "individuals", where it occurs in said amendment, strike out the language down to and including the word "amended", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including not to exceed \$10,000 per annum for an Administrator, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, including not to exceed \$50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 69, line 11, strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 86. In doing that I point out that in the presentation of this bill to the House on April 14, I expressed my views regarding the subject matter of this amendment, and the amount of money which ought to be made available to carry out the obligations of the Agri-

cultural Adjustment Administration for certain types of benefits, according to an announcement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on December 5, 1942. I have offered this motion, therefore, because it represents the viewpoint of the members of the subcommittee, other than myself. I shall now be glad to yield time both for and against the motion which I have made, to gentlemen who desire recognition for that purpose.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina offers a preferential motion that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 86.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, in the words of the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, that we have often heard on this floor: "Men, this is an important matter, and I want you to hear me." Prior to this year we had an obligation to the farmers of this country to the amount of \$500,000,000, in connection with the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program. For the present year we have a definite obligation to the farmers to the extent of \$400,000,000 in connection with soil conservation, tied in with production. I wonder if there is a single Member on the floor of this House who does not realize that at this time the serious problem that confronts this country is the possibility of a tremendous shortage of food products this year. I wonder if there is a single Member on the floor of the House who does not realize that those who oppose my motion at this time in this great emergency are simply adding to the dissatisfaction and confusion under which farmers are trying to operate their farms and that they are defeating proper production. I am speaking now as a farmer at this time. My farm is definitely tied in with the soil-conservation program, which is one of the best programs we have ever had in connection with all of these farm programs. Every tenant farmer working on a share-crop basis is carrying out a definite program entered into last fall in connection with production and soil conservation, which is so necessary and essential at this time to bring about the production that you are going to need, not only to win this war, but to win the peace. My committee and I have been doing everything possible during the past year, 1942, and up to this good hour to get over to the various war agencies, and those in charge of our farm programs, the serious situation confronting agriculture. And now certain Members have gotten into a certain state of mind—that is, they are going to break down every New Deal program by taking advantage of this emergency regardless of merits or contracts with farmers.

As I stated awhile ago, this particular item is for soil conservation and is tied in with production. It has nothing to do with subsidy or incentive payments; it is as stated, tied in under the soil-conservation program, with production of crops that we will need so badly to win this war. I hope that you will support my motion, so that our Government will be able to carry out its contracts with the farmers of this country, who are working long hours to produce the necessary food to win this war.

I want to tell you before this year is ended I would not be at all surprised if you do not have considerable trouble in a great many of the cities and certain sections of the country because of hungry people.

I hope that my motion will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that the conferees have taken off the lid on the \$500 limit on these payments again this year. It may be the part of wisdom for us, as Members of Congress, when agricultural products are bringing 50 to 75 percent of parity, like in 1939, to take money out of the United States Treasury to help the farmer over the hill. But in view of the situation that exists today, I just wonder how much wisdom there is to take moneys out of our great grandchildren's inheritances and send out checks of \$10,000 to \$100,000 to big operators.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield in just a minute. We agreed in this House to limit these payments to \$500. If there is anyone who can stand up here and tell me why you want to have these big checks of \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, or even \$100,000 paid to insurance companies or big land owners of this country at this time, I would like to know what argument you are going to make when they ask you for a roll-back subsidy to feed the people in the low-income brackets of our country. If we can give out five, ten, or fifteen or seventeen thousand dollars to Campbell out in Montana each year for raising wheat or for not raising it year after year, right during this war, and then say we cannot help pay the grocery bill for someone whose income has been frozen at \$9 a month in the form of an old-age pension, I say it is not, in my opinion, a fair and reasonable national policy. It is something that will slap back in the face of the big farmer operators when this war is over.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman feel that Congress should keep faith with the Secretary of Agriculture, the individual official who was authorized to



make these commitments? Does not the gentleman feel that Congress should keep faith with the farmers to whom the commitments have been made?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely want the New Deal to keep its word with everybody, and most assuredly with the farmers and with all other groups. But there is nothing in what I have said that would give them any reason for not keeping faith, because there is nothing in what I have said that indicates we cannot legally and morally restrict these payments to \$500. You do not have to pay up to \$100,000 in subsidy checks when it is not based either on common sense or common justice. It most assuredly does not make sense during wartime.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] does not prevail and is not adopted, then we are breaking faith with the farmers of America, because we have promised them this \$400,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman I was not talking about the total money that goes to the farmers. I am talking about the size of the checks that are being paid to the big operators at this time, 6,400 big operators in Texas obtain \$12,000,000 a year, or more than 150,000 farmers in New York State. Does that make sense even in peacetime?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, that is not involved in the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I discussed this matter with the gentleman one other time. How are you going to be fair with the farmer who happens to own quite a lot of land and has 10 or 12 or 15 or 50 renters, and say that he shall not receive more than \$500, and he has to tell his tenants that they are out of the program; because the landlord will automatically go out when the payments are limited? Are you going to say to that man that he will not get any money and then say to the man a mile down the road he is going to get up to \$499?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is just a matter of philosophy. If the gentleman thinks it is good governmental policy to take money in the form of \$1,000 to \$100,000 checks out of the United States Treasury at the present time, you can follow that program if you so desire but I do not believe in it. If we subsidize anyone it should be the man that owns, lives on, and operates his own farm.

Mr. ARENDS. Let us pay them all in fairness, or else pay none.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If we are going to do that we will have to change a lot of things, because a large percentage of the farmers of the United States get only \$20.

The list of payees is increased by making thousands of \$20 payments in order to show that a high percentage of the farmers are in the program. Most of the money goes to the big operators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2869, a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be up for consideration tomorrow. This agency of the Government has made some mistakes and we may not agree with everything it has done, but, as a whole, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation has done a great job for the American people.

I will undertake to give briefly some of the accomplishments of this Corporation from the time it was created up to the present time, and I hope, when the bill is up for final passage, that we all will see the necessity of extending the life of this Corporation which has been so helpful in stabilizing the prices of agricultural products.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation was created in 1933 to deal with the agricultural surpluses and the depressed financial condition of farmers at that time the total cash farm income in the United States was less than \$5,500,000,000. The cash income of cotton growers was less than \$600,000,000 and of tobacco growers little more than \$150,000,000. In contrast with these low figures in 1933, the cash farm income in the United States in 1942 totaled more than \$16,000,000,000 and it is expected that the aggregate will be even larger this year. The cash income of cotton growers in 1942 totaled more than \$1,500,000,000 and of the tobacco growers nearly \$500,000,000.

Now, of course, all of this satisfying increase in income is not entirely the result of the work of the Commodity Credit Corporation. During the last 3 years we have had a war economy, and at such times prices always rise. Nevertheless, the Corporation has contributed importantly to the increase in farm income during the last 10 years, through its loan and purchase operations tending to increase the prices received by farmers and to stabilize farm income. But the Corporation has done considerably more, through the building of granary supplies of commodities which have made possible enormous increases in livestock production during the last few years and—with regard to cotton—made supplies available for the expanded wartime production of military and civilian goods.

A few years ago the critics of the Corporation looked at the huge supplies of feed and fiber and said they would never be marketed in the normal channels of trade. The fact is that today the Corporation is practically out of corn, and its loan and owned stocks of cotton are little more than half what they were in 1939. The Corporation owns today more than 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and

holds as collateral for loans an additional 135,000,000 bushels. A few years ago these large stocks of wheat would have been regarded as excessive, but at the rate of our present consumption of wheat for food and feed plus the fact that the 1943 wheat crop has been estimated at only 730,000,000 bushels, it is certain that the granary supplies of wheat will have been reduced sharply by the summer of 1944.

The earliest operations of the Corporation in 1933 dealt with cotton and corn. The average farm price of cotton in 1932 had been about 6½ cents a pound and the average farm price of 1932-crop corn was 32 cents a bushel. Nearly 2,000,000 bales of 1933 cotton went under Government loan and nearly 268,000,000 bushels of corn. These loans were important factors in raising prices of the 1933 crops, cotton in that year averaging farmers better than 10 cents a pound as contrasted with 6½ cents for the 1932 crop; and of corn, better than 52 cents a bushel. Since that time the price of cotton has never fallen below 8½ cents as a season average price and it is now approximately 20 cents a pound or practically at parity, despite a prospective 1943-44 carry-over of approximately ten and one-half million bales. The price of corn since 1933 has never averaged less than 48 cents a bushel and it is now approximately \$1.03 a bushel.

The value of the granary created by the Commodity Credit Corporation was proved at the very outset when drought struck the Nation in 1934 and the big quantity of corn which had been put under loan was drawn upon to help make up the deficit in our feed supplies and thus prevent an even greater liquidation of livestock than that which actually occurred. During the last 10 years more than 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn were put under loan, but the loan stocks now total less than 100,000,000 bushels. During the 4 years of good crops from 1938 through 1941 more than 700,000,000 bushels of corn went under loan and were subsequently utilized to expand our livestock production.

Loans have been made on more than 25,000,000 bales of cotton during the last 10 years. But at the moment the loan and owned stocks total less than 7,000,000 bales, most of the remainder having been redeemed by farmers. The most cotton going under loan in any one year totaled 5,600,000 bales in 1937 when the South produced a record crop of nearly 19,000,000 bales. In December 1939, the total of owned and loan stocks was nearly 12,000,000 bales, of which about 7,000,000 bales were owned by the Government. By August 1940, the owned and loan stocks were down to 8,000,000 bales. But when the 1940 crop came in the stocks increased again and by January 1941, the total was a little more than 11,000,000 bales, of which the Government owned about 6,000,000 bales.

The big reduction in cotton stocks for war needs was begun at this point. The Corporation exchanged 600,000 bales of cotton for rubber in a barter deal with Great Britain, and we wish now that the amount could have been much larger. During the fiscal year 1940-41 there was

a reduction of nearly 90,000 bales in the Government stocks as a result of trade exchanges of low grades for high grades. The following year the Government sold more than 1,000,000 bales to the domestic trade under a general sales program authorized by Congress and sales for export totaled more than 400,000 bales in addition. During the last few years more than 50,000 bales of cotton have been sold in connection with the development of new uses for cotton, as well as 25,000 bales in connection with the Government's mattress program. The lend-lease shipments of cotton to date have totaled approximately one and one-half million bales.

During the last 2 years the Corporation has played an active part in the Government's program to increase the production of the higher qualities of cotton especially needed for the production of military goods. The effort has been not only to increase the output of long staple cotton but to improve the quality of cotton grown all over the belt. In its cotton-loan programs the Corporation has offered special inducements toward this end through its premiums on grades and staple lengths. So great has been the utilization of the higher qualities of cotton during the last 2 years, that unless we have an unusually good grade crop in 1943, many mills may have to use lower grades than have been used during the past year. Studies are now under way in connection with the advisability of making changes in specifications of Government purchases of cotton goods, as well as other means of economizing in the use of the scarce qualities of cotton. In view of the limited supply situation with regard to the higher qualities, a program must be worked out looking toward greater use of the shorter staples and lower grades in our lend-lease program.

As it has gained in experience the Corporation has frequently been able to come to the aid of the cotton farmers in ways which were not obvious a decade ago. In April of this year a proposal was made by some elements of the cotton industry to put a ceiling on cotton prices. The difficulty of administering such a ceiling may well be imagined when you consider there are more than 600 different qualities of cotton, which would mean more than 600 different prices.

The Corporation has cooperated with other Government agencies in making possible the use of cotton bagging to supplement the supplies of jute available for covering the 1943 cotton crop. Approximately two and one-half million patterns are being offered for sale by the Corporation at the present time and additional quantities will be available when contracts with manufacturers of cotton bagging are completed. The Corporation is also selling a surplus of first-cut cotton linters which are not needed by the Government for chemical uses.

Commodity Credit Corporation loan and purchase programs have greatly benefited the tobacco growers. Loans to date have been made on approximately 200,000,000 pounds of tobacco and purchases have totaled nearly 700,000,000 pounds. Loans are now outstanding on a little more than 11,000,000 pounds, and

the Corporation owns about 286,000,000 pounds of tobacco. Most of the loans and purchases have been made since the outbreak of World War No. 2 in Europe. Shortly after the outbreak of the war British funds were necessarily withdrawn from the tobacco markets. The loss of this business was a great shock not only to our tobacco growers but to all those engaged in the buying, packing, and selling of tobacco for export. To cope with this situation a plan was worked out under which tobacco would be bought by export companies either for the account of or for sales to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the companies to hold an option to repurchase the tobacco at cost plus charges. In this way it has been possible to maintain the British market for American tobacco without loss to our growers.

In 1932 the season average farm price of flue-cured tobacco was less than 12 cents a pound. In 1942 the season average was better than 38 cents a pound. Prices received by farmers for the major noncigar types of tobacco in 1942 were the highest in many years. The price of burley tobacco, averaging 42 cents a pound, was the highest on record, and the price of flue-cured was the highest since 1919. Cash farm income from tobacco in 1942 was more than \$483,000,000 as compared with less than half that sum in 1940.

In connection with the production of fats and oils, the Commodity Credit Corporation is playing an important war role. In the South we are especially concerned with the production of peanut and cottonseed oils so vitally needed this year to help make up the deficit in imported fats and oils and to make possible adequate supplies for civilian and military use, as well as export to our allies.

Prior to World War No. 2 the United States had normally imported 15 to 20 percent of its supplies of fats and oils, and exported only small quantities. War reduced the volume of imports and increased the demand for exports, a situation which was further aggravated after Pearl Harbor, since a large part of our imports had previously come from the Pacific. To meet this situation the Department of Agriculture last year urged farmers to increase the domestic production of soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts for oil, and offered in this connection to support the prices of these oil seeds at specified minimum levels. A comparable support price for cottonseed was offered. Farmers planted record acreages of soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts. The volume of peanuts picked and threshed totaled more than 2½ billion pounds as compared with less than 1½ billion in 1941.

The need for vegetable oils is so great that this year the production goal for peanuts has been raised to more than 5,000,000 acres. In order to induce the attainment of this goal the War Food Administration has proclaimed the discontinuance of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and has announced a one-price system under which prices to farmers will be supported at \$130 to \$140 a ton. The program will be operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation under

contracts with handlers, who will purchase, store, and sell farmers' stock peanuts only for the account of the Corporation.

The normal trade channels, including peanut-producing cooperative associations, crushers, and shellers, will be used by the Corporation agents under handlers' contracts. Purchases from producers will be made at uniform prices which shall be not less than \$140 per ton for Spanish and Virginia types and \$130 per ton for runner type with appropriate differentials for grades. These prices are approximately 17 percent below the ceiling prices for farmers' stock peanuts but about 75 percent above the value of peanuts when sold for crushing for oil and meal.

Peanuts will be sold by the Corporation for cleaning and shelling for edible uses in relation to ceiling prices and for crushing purposes at their product value. On a basis of existing ceiling prices for products, farmers' stock peanuts for crushing are worth \$75 to \$85 per ton, depending on oil and protein content. Profits received by the Corporation on the sale of peanuts for cleaning and shelling will be applied against the loss on sales of peanuts for crushing and to other costs including inspection, grading, handling, interest, and storage.

Growers of peanuts, in a referendum held April 26, 1941, had approved marketing quotas for peanuts produced in the calendar years 1941, 1942, and 1943. In the proclamation issued last week the War Food Administrator indicated that the termination of marketing quotas is necessary to effectuate the declared policy of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and in order to meet the present national need for increased production of vegetable food and feed products.

During the last 5 years the Corporation has made loans on more than 1,300,000,000 bushels of wheat. The loan stocks now total less than 135,000,000 bushels and the Corporation owns about 330,000,000 bushels which had been relinquished by farmers under the non-recourse provisions of the loan program. This is the largest quantity of wheat ever owned by the Corporation and it is in addition to nearly 300,000,000 bushels sold by the Corporation for feed and for manufacture into industrial alcohol for the production of war explosives.

The Corporation's feed-wheat program has been especially helpful to the dairy and poultry industries in the deficit feed-producing areas in that it has made possible the continued production of milk and eggs at the high levels needed during this period of war. When the wheat loan program was instituted in 1938 the farmers were averaging only 56 cents a bushel for wheat. The latest price report of the Department of Agriculture shows that in mid-May of this year, the average farm price of wheat was \$1.23 a bushel.

Only last summer it appeared as though the United States had a 2 years' supply of wheat, predicated upon an expected disappearance of 800,000,000 bushels a year. The fact is that during the wheat-marketing year now drawing



to a close the disappearance of wheat has exceeded 1,000,000,000 bushels and the carry-over is the equivalent of little more than a 6 months' supply. The winter wheat crop now being harvested has been estimated at only 500,000,000 bushels, and it looks as though the spring wheat crop to be harvested later in the season will total only 229,000,000 bushels in addition. Thus, we will have a total supply of only 1,300,000,000 bushels of wheat during the coming year or only about 250,000,000 bushels more than the prospective disappearance during this period. In view of this situation and the fact that the total supply of feed grains is insufficient to maintain livestock production at its present wartime level, the War Food Administration is increasing the wheat acreage allotments for the crop to be planted this fall.

Prior to the entry of the United States into World War No. 2 the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation dealt mainly with the making of loans on basic farm commodities. A large proportion of these loans were made by local banks with payments guaranteed under the nonrecourse provision of the Commodity Credit Corporation contracts. By taking large quantities of commodities off the market in years of flush production the Corporation made possible not only the maintenance and stabilization of prices at fair levels to producers but made possible the accumulating of supplies which ultimately proved so valuable in our wartime food expansion program. Other features of this program during the last 2 years have included price supports to farmers at levels which encouraged them to increase the production of war crops.

An invaluable activity during the last 2 years has been the financing by the Corporation of purchases of food for lend-lease. This operation has made possible the purchasing of food during seasons of flush production and the stabilizing of prices during these periods of the year. The Corporation purchases to date for lend-lease have totaled approximately \$2,000,000,000, of which more than three-fourths have been repaid and the remainder is represented by moneys still owing the Corporation or by inventories of commodities earmarked for future shipment.

Another wartime activity of the Corporation has been its control over the importation of practically all agricultural products coming into the United States. Practically all of these operations have been conducted without loss, except with regard to coffee and sugar, where the Corporation pays a part of the increased transportation costs for the purpose of preserving the ceiling prices of these commodities. The management of agricultural imports by the Corporation has kept at a minimum wartime disruption of trade with our allies and friendly neutrals. It has made possible the continuing of exports from these countries within the limits of available shipping space. It has also provided outlets for commodities formerly exported to the Axis countries.

The Corporation states that the primary purpose of its purchase and resale

operations has been to increase the production of food and industrial products vitally needed in these wartimes.

During the last 10 years loans and purchases of all commodities by the Corporation have totaled approximately \$6,000,000,000, of which \$2,000,000,000 were on account of purchases for lend-lease during the last 2 years. Loans and purchases by the Corporation other than for lend-lease during the last 2 years have totaled about \$2,000,000,000 as contrasted with \$2,000,000,000 during all of the preceding 8 years.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret the conference committee eliminated the amendment that was placed in this legislation by the House limiting soil-conservation payments to \$500 for an individual participating in the farm program. It ought to be understood that these limitations were on soil-conservation payments. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years this Congress has appropriated a half billion dollars each year for soil conservation. About forty or fifty millions of this amount was paid to about half of the farmers. About 80 percent of those who have taken part in the soil-conservation program since it began got less than \$100 each. Life insurance companies and other big operators have been paid thousands and thousands of dollars that they really did not need and who should, of course, have been willing to conserve their soil without payments from the Federal Treasury.

Soil-conservation payments were made in the first place for about three purposes: To help the farmer out at a time when prices were extremely low, to help conserve the soil, and for the purpose of cutting down the amount of crops raised. Millions of dollars have been taken from the Federal Treasury to pay farmers for not raising crops. They were advised that by cutting down their acreage and reducing the amount of crops they would be entitled to payments therefor. We operated too long on the theory we could have prosperity on a program of planned scarcity. It seems to me that rather than spend \$500,000,000, most of which will go to big operators, it would be much more sensible to release the restrictions, let the farmer plant all the crops he can and pay him a recent price for all of the crops he raises. Mr. Speaker, in 1941, and in other years, we paid about half of the farmers approximately 10 percent of the amount appropriated and paid about \$40,000,000 to administer the act. The rest of the money went to the large operators. By striking out the \$500 limitation, the sky is the limit as to the amount anyone may receive if he complies with the program. Mr. Speaker, we have a different situation from that which existed a few years ago. We find ourselves today with a food shortage facing us. We curtailed our acreage of corn. Now we have a shortage of corn. There is a shortage of beef and other meat products. Personally, I am concerned with regard to food shortages. Mr. Speaker, farmers in general are not

looking for subsidies. What they want is a decent and fair price for their products, such prices being in line with what they are required to pay for the things they need. Farmers do not want to be restricted. They want a free hand and an equal chance with the other fellow. Let me say again, I am in favor of a fair soil-conservation program, reasonably administered but I do not think funds should be appropriated at this time to be used for the restriction of growing crops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 8 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first, let us define the issue. The issue is not the subject matter discussed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. That particular amendment that he alluded to was agreed to in conference and is not before us now. The amendment before us now is the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to increase from \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000 the amount of available money for soil conservation and domestic allotments.

This should really be reduced to \$200,000,000 rather than increased to \$400,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at the moment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How can you say that when the sky is the limit?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment and I am opposed to writing another \$100,000,000 into this bill because it will violate every action that this very House has heretofore taken. On Friday last this House adopted a proposal in connection with the Office of Price Administration against subsidies. Tomorrow a proposal will come in here in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, section 6 of which was written by the Banking and Currency Committee of this House, with an interdiction and restriction upon subsidies. Are we going now to write \$100,000,000 in this bill which is clearly a subsidy? Two hundred million dollars is enough for soil compliance practices. To be accurate about it, \$187,000,000 will be enough. The gentleman from South Carolina proposes now to write in \$100,000,000 extra in the face of every expression this House has taken on the subject of subsidies. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] raises the question of good faith, but he can examine every document that has come from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration or from the Secretary of Agriculture, and he can examine the text of every radio speech that the Secretary made in which he says that the farmers would receive it contingent upon appropriations that are made by the Congress—he made no promise, he made a sort of conditional intimation that if the money were voted then that program would be carried out. There is more than enough for soil compliance, there is more than enough for soil-build-

ing practices. Why add \$100,000,000 when it is not needed?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean to leave the impression with the House that the Secretary of Agriculture has made no commitments with regard to this fund?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean to say that the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture have not made a single commitment that is not conditional upon appropriations by this Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, if I understand the situation, Congress authorized the Secretary to make commitments up to \$500,000,000. He has made commitments up to \$400,000,000 and, of course, the gentleman is correct in saying that the receipt of the money is conditioned upon the action of this Congress in redeeming the faith of the Government that is involved in these transactions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the gentleman is incorrect. The program itself is conditioned upon an appropriation made by Congress. I suggest that the gentleman read the text of official statements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, either he made commitments or he did not make commitments. If he did not make commitments the gentleman's argument, of course, is sound; but if he made those commitments the gentleman as a Representative ought to redeem the faith of this Government and not break faith with the farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There could be no absolute commitment until Congress provided the money.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not?

Mr. FULMER. That is what I wanted to ask, how the Government could make any commitment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not make that statement; I said they were contingent upon the appropriation of the money. I suppose that on Wednesday the House will take action supporting that which it took last Friday, taking action to adopt section 6 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and once more set its foot down against a subsidy proposal. Are we going to follow that or are we going to be inconsistent here today by writing in another \$100,000,000 in this bill for payments other than soil-building practices?

Mr. COOLEY. How is a subsidy involved in this proposition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because it is divorced from soil compliance, and that is the distinction that ought to be made. There is a soil compliance and a soil-building practice which runs to the land, it does not make any difference who owns the farm, if the soil is enriched or is rebuilt, if the payment inures to the enrichment of our natural resource, the soil, which is a very justifiable payment. It does not make any difference whether John Doe, Jim Brown, or Jack Smith owns 160 acres or half a section, if he farms it in accordance with the prescribed procedure that money runs to the soil. It is proposed now to come in for subsidies

that are in addition to that and for which this \$100,000,000 would be used.

When the matter was first before us the \$400,000,000 was to be distributed as follows: About \$187,000,000, as I recall, for soil-compliance practices—and nobody quarrels about those. Then, in addition, we were going to make a payment of 11/1000 cent a pound on cotton. That would be an estimated \$77,000,000. We were going to make a payment of a little over 3 cents on corn; that would have taken \$50,000,000; 9 cents on wheat that would have taken \$60,000,000; \$1.10 a ton on peanuts that would have taken \$791,000; \$651,000 for rice; \$7,000,000 for tobacco, and \$19,500,000 for range land. It had nothing to do with soil building, nothing to do with these practices of enriching the earth. It is a subsidy pure and simple. So this amendment ought to be voted down overwhelmingly, because if it is approved we repudiate what we did on Friday, we repudiate every expression against subsidies that has heretofore been made by this House and we shall find ourselves in a very anomalous position when the Commodity Credit bill comes to the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. How much money will be needed to carry out the commitments which the farmer understood were made at the time he signed up for farm compliance in this program for this year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For soil-compliance payments?

Mr. CASE. For all payments of whatever nature that he understood he was to get, that he signed up for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The \$300,000,000 would cover all those soil-conservation practices.

Mr. CASE. Is that what he understood he was going to get?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did not understand he was to get anything, as a matter of fact, until Congress provided the funds and the Department of Agriculture has made that contingency quite clear.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I would like to know what the testimony indicates regarding the commitments which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture from this fund.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that what the law and testimony indicates to my mind is not necessarily the viewpoint of my colleagues on the subcommittee. I took the position when the bill was presented to the House that section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make commitments for these benefits in advance of the year in which they are to be paid up to but not exceeding the amount of \$500,000,000. The evidence discloses that the Secretary, on December 5, 1942, announced the program for soil-conservation payments and for these acreage-allotment payments—adjustment pay-

ments, as they are sometimes called—for which the Budget estimated \$400,000,000 would be needed to comply with the obligations of the Government. That is about as far as I think I could go with the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if he has regarded the commitments as conditional, as discussed a moment ago by the gentleman from Illinois, or if he regards them as moral obligations of this Government?

Mr. TARVER. I regard them as a moral obligation of the Government. I so expressed myself originally when this bill was presented to the House. The Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law offered the farmers of the country certain benefits for certain performances and the farmers by execution of farm plans accepted the proposition which to my mind makes a contract. It seems to me if this plan should be changed it ought to be changed for next year and not for this year. But that is only my individual view. I am not speaking for the subcommittee because all the members of the subcommittee except myself entertain the contrary view.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has discussed the point I had in mind and that is that the faith of the Government is involved in these transactions and we should now redeem the faith of the Government.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I want to ask the Chairman of the subcommittee a question. I would like to know if Chester Davis has made a statement relative to the commitments made by the Government to the farmers?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. Mr. Davis appeared before the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations and I quote this from his statement:

The first important point I want to discuss is the \$100,000,000 cut made by the House in the \$400,000,000 agricultural conservation appropriation. In December 1942, the Department of Agriculture announced the provisions, including rates of payment, for the 1943 agricultural conservation program. It is customary to make the announcement in December so that farmers may study the program in advance of the planting season and make the necessary plans to participate. Farmers responded on the basis of the announced provisions and rates. Since this program is one of several designed to bring about the greatest production of food for the country, I feel that the \$100,000,000 eliminated by the House in the item "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources" should be restored, and that the House language, which may be interpreted to mean that these funds cannot be used for acreage allotment payments, should be eliminated. In this way the Department of Agriculture will be able to carry out the announced provisions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, thus fulfilling the commitments in response to which farmers have participated generally and in large numbers.



Mr. FLANNAGAN. I understand from Mr. Davis' statement that back in December the Department of Agriculture announced such a program.

Mr. TARVER. On December 5.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In order to carry that program out the Secretary stated that he would need \$400,000,000?

Mr. TARVER. The Budget has estimated it would be that much.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Davis concurs in that statement.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And having made the proposition in December, he thereupon asked the House for \$300,000,000 for incentive payments. This is for incentive payments. The House refused to give him the \$300,000,000 and the subcommittee announced on the 15th of February that it would not supply the money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is in error about the \$300,000,000. He undoubtedly meant to say \$100,000,000. The Secretary of Agriculture asked approval of an estimate of \$100,000,000 for so-called incentive payments which estimate was denied by our subcommittee. It has not been restored by the Senate. That is not in any way involved here. He asked originally \$400,000,000 for these payments which are here involved and the Budget approved that estimate.

Mr. COOLEY. And he regarded it as a commitment and as a moral obligation of this Government?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. And he cannot carry out that obligation unless the House now provides the money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that on February 15 two subcommittees of the House denied that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it not true that on February 15, before anybody had planted any crops anywhere, before a single acre in the United States had been seeded, the House refused money for this purpose?

Mr. COOLEY. I did not understand the gentleman from Georgia to put that interpretation upon the actions of the House. The gentleman from Georgia announced in the beginning that out of the seven members of the subcommittee he was the only one who took this position, the other six members taking the position that having denied the money we were under no obligation and that the Government was under no obligation. The gentleman has read Mr. Chester Davis' letter. Does not that letter indicate that he, who is now in charge of the food program, regards it as a commitment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Two subcommittees denied subsidies for this purpose long before any farmer could have accepted a proposition to plant for

incentive payments. There could have been no commitment.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not consider this a subsidy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is money for subsidy purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the argument submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina. The implication of his remarks was that we need these funds to produce more food for wartime. It is just exactly the opposite. The more money you appropriate for subsidies to take land out of production the less food we shall have for the time being. The soil-conservation program is a long-time program. It certainly is not a war program. If we took everything off it would be the best thing consistent with the war-food program, if we had no control at this time, so the argument certainly does not hold good that this is part of a food-producing program for the war effort.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. That is the trouble with the statements a great many gentlemen make. There is no control over any crop in this country at this time, this year, except cotton, and that has been increased 10 percent. We have a lot of surplus cotton.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is not that the best reason why this money should not be voted, that the quotas have been suspended on everything except cotton?

Mr. FULMER. Not at all, for the reason that this money was promised to the farmer. It was said, "If you will plant 50 acres of this and 100 acres of that and forego this other crop, you will receive these payments." They are doing it. They are expecting this money. Every move that is made by O. P. A. and this Congress at this time is destroying these farmers. You are going to wake up with a tremendous shortage of food.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Let me reiterate what the chairman of the whole committee, the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON] said. This was called to our attention early in February. Both the Subcommittee on Agriculture and

the Deficiency Subcommittee denied subsidies, after the Secretary of Agriculture had come before us and before any crops were put in the ground for 1943. We went on record definitely against any subsidy payments for this year. If they have gone out and in defiance of two committees of the House and made commitments, we of the House are not under obligation to go back on the stand we have taken a half a dozen times on these subsidies and incentive payments and vote \$100,000,000 more to reverse ourselves at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's statement indicates that he himself regards these transactions as commitments.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No, I do not.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is taking the position that they are made without authority, but the Secretary did have authority by law to make these commitments. If they are commitments, we ought to carry them out.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. He had no authority to make them after the House spoke, and the House is superior to the Secretary of Agriculture, when it has spoken, where it originates appropriations. I sincerely hope that the House will sustain the attitude of the committee on this proposition.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House should make very sure just what it is doing at this time. There is a tendency to confuse two entirely different propositions. The amendment presently before us is amendment No. 86, which relates to payments under the Soil Conservation Act and embraces two different types of payments, one for soil-conservation practices and the other the C. A. P., the crop adjustment payments. Some of the debate that has come in would confuse the issue with the vote that will come on amendment No. 88, which is related to incentive payments.

If you want to stand by the action of the committee when it served notice upon the Secretary of Agriculture and upon the farmers of the country in February that the committee would not make an appropriation for incentive payments, when we come to No. 88 you should vote to stand by the House position and not yield, but do not confuse that vote on incentive payments with the vote we have now on payments under the Soil Conservation Act, which embraces two types of payments, soil-conservation and crop-adjustment payments, both under the law in operation for several years.

When the representatives of the Department of Agriculture went out to the farmers last November or along about that time and signed them up on a crop plan for their compliance in this crop year, they held out to them at that time, without any adverse notice from the Committee on Appropriations or anybody representing this House, that they could make payments to them under the law for two things, for soil-conservation

practices and for crop adjustment. No notice was given to the Secretary of Agriculture and no notice was given to the farmers at that time that there would not be money available for making those payments.

The question I asked the gentleman from Illinois was designed to bring out the fact of how much money is needed to carry out the commitments the Secretary of Agriculture or his representatives in good faith made with the farmers at the time the farmers were making their crop plans for this year. I would yield to anybody who could authoritatively tell me how much money is needed to carry out that commitment. I yield to the chairman of the committee if he can tell me how much money is needed to carry out the program that was held out to the farmers at the time they were asked to sign up.

Mr. TARVER. All the evidence submitted to the subcommittee was that \$400,000,000 would be required. I am not familiar with any other evidence submitted.

Mr. CASE. If that is \$400,000,000, it is an obligation, and it is the same obligation under which the Congress appropriated money to carry out and make payments under the original triple-A act after it was invalidated by the Supreme Court. After those commitments had been made and the farmers had adjusted their crops, although the act was invalidated, Congress recognized the obligation and made the appropriation to carry it out. We find ourselves in a situation where a similar principle of good faith is involved here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall use the 3 minutes. There is just one thing I want to say about it, and I hope I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, to clear up one question. In response to a question asked the chairman of the subcommittee by the last speaker, he stated that this understanding was that last year in December when the Secretary of Agriculture announced a farm program for this year, commitments were made in a sum around \$400,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. That is the amount which the Budget estimated will be necessary to make good the promises made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. When the farm program was announced?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I further understand from the chairman of the subcommittee that Mr. Davis, who now has charge of our food program, recently made the statement that this Government was committed in the sum of \$400,000,000 to the farmers of America.

Mr. TARVER. That is Mr. Davis' position, that it will take \$400,000,000 to carry out the obligations,

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in his usual very effective and seductive way, able legislator that he is, differentiated as between amendment No. 81 and amendment No. 83 insofar as the amount is concerned. That was good parliamentary strategy, but poor policy. He knows just as well as I do that if you give 81 the million dollars, it is only for the purpose of using it for subsidies though a rose by any other name smells as sweet to some people. Such action taken is against that reckless fiscal policy to which this House has so often registered itself so sensibly in opposition. This amendment is a subversive method of accomplishing and establishing an undesirable and reprehensible course for the Government to follow. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman cannot yield the time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That is so, and I agree. However, I can yield for a question, as the gentleman will agree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to interrogate the gentleman from Vermont, and just to make this matter authentic, let me read to the House the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 12th of February, given to the subcommittee:

All rates of payments under the 1943 agricultural conservation program are, of course, dependent upon the actual amount of appropriations by Congress.

Further, on page 817 of the hearings he says:

The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose; and the amount of such payments will necessarily be within the limits finally determined by such appropriation.

Mr. CASE. I just want to ask the gentleman from Illinois what time they plant winter wheat in Illinois; whether or not that would do any good—a statement made in February—if the farmer had already planted wheat back in the fall?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend forgets that the statement of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration containing this language in their official bulletin went out as early as November of last year.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I hope that we will clearly understand this issue. We shall have a roll call on the pending motion, and the House should definitely determine just what its position is with reference to this subject matter. I have my view of the law and the obligations which have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture, by authority of law, but I am not a Solomon. I may be entirely wrong. The other members of my subcommittee have indicated that in their opinion I am wrong, but I feel that it is my duty to express my views and convictions

in the matter to the membership of the House, to do what I can to clarify the issue.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield now. There is no question, at least I have never heard any raised, but that the Secretary of Agriculture had authority last fall to commit the Government to payments under that program, up to but not exceeding \$500,000,000. That is the construction placed by the Solicitor of the Department on section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I have never heard that construction questioned by anybody. The Secretary of Agriculture did announce a program, and the Budget estimated that it would require \$400,000,000 to pay the obligations of the Government under that program. I read a while ago the statement or part of the statement made by Mr. Davis in regard to this subject matter. Some question has since been raised with regard to what he did say. I do not desire to cumber the Record by a repetition of what I read awhile ago, but let me read this additional part of his statement before the Senate committee which I think clarifies his position:

Please let me emphasize that the commitments I refer to were made last winter and apply to this year's crop, much of it already in the ground. With regard to crops to be planted this fall and in 1944, the House inserted language that limits all conservation and adjustment commitments to \$300,000,000. No prior commitments have been made on that next crop, and I see no reason why we cannot operate under the House limitation.

In other words, Mr. Davis says that the Government is obligated to make these payments that the Secretary promised in his testimony on this year's crops, but with the limitation that the House has put on the program for next year's crop, and with what may be done under that program he finds no fault. But he cannot see and I cannot see how we can place ourselves in the attitude of repudiating an obligation incurred under authority of law to the farmers of this country. If you do not provide this \$100,000,000, which brings it up to the Budget estimate and does not exceed the Budget estimate at all, as contemplated by the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] then in my judgment you are repudiating an obligation of the Government.

This incentive payment business that we have heard so much about did not arise until February. That was the \$100,000,000 Budget estimate which we declined for incentive payments to bring about the production of some eight or nine war crops in increased quantities. That is not in this bill. That was rejected by the subcommittee in the House and never has been put in in the House or the Senate, in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. Those payments are not to be made out of this fund in any event. The only payments which the Secretary has contracted to make were announced by him on December 5, 1942. I hold in my hand the Georgia A. A. A. handbook, giving the



exact payments which are promised to the farmers of the country, issued in March of this year. Similar handbooks were published in every State. Are you going back on that promise—what your Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law promised to do?

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Have not these payments always been contingent upon subsequent appropriation?

Mr. TARVER. For 7 years this practice has been followed. No other practice has been followed since we had this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 81, noes 103.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and three Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 175, answering "present" 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—185

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Kefauver
Allen, La.	Doughton	Kelley
Andersen,	Drewry	Kennedy
H. Carl	Feighan	Keogh
Anderson,	Fernandez	Kerr
N. Mex.	Fisher	Kirwan
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Kleberg
Beckworth	Fogarty	Klein
Bland	Folger	Lane
Bloom	Forand	Lanham
Bonner	Fulbright	Larcade
Boykin	Fulmer	Lemke
Bradley, Pa.	Gathings	Lesinski
Brooks	Gibson	McCord
Brown, Ga.	Gilchrist	McCormack
Bryson	Gordon	McGehee
Bulwinkle	Gore	McGranery
Burch, Va.	Gorski	McKenzie
Burchill, N. Y.	Gossett	McMurray
Burdick	Granger	Madden
Burgin	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Byrne	Gregory	Maloney
Camp	Hagen	Manasco
Case	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield,
Celler	Harris, Ark.	Mont.
Chapman	Harris, Va.	Mansfield, Tex.
Clark	Hart	Marcantonio
Coffee	Hays	Martin, Iowa
Colmer	Heffernan	Merritt
Cooley	Hendricks	Miller, Nebr.
Cooper	Hobbs	Mills
Cox	Hoch	Morrison, La.
Cravens	Hoeven	Morrison, N. C.
Creal	Hollifield	Murdock
Crosser	Hope	Murphy
Cunningham	Hull	Myers
Curley	Izac	Norton
D'Alesandro	Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.
Davis	Johnson,	O'Connor
Dawson	Luther A.	O'Hara
Delaney	Johnson,	O'Konski
Dilweg	Lyndon B.	O'Toole
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Outland
Disney	Kee	Face

Patman	Scanlon	Thomason
Patton	Sheppard	Vincent, Ky.
Peterson, Fla.	Sikes	Voorhis, Calif.
Peterson, Ga.	Slaughter	Walter
Pfeifer	Smith, Va.	Ward
Poage	Smith, W. Va.	Weaver
Price	Snyder	Weiss-
Priest	Somers, N. Y.	Wene
Rabaut	Sparkman	Whelchel, Ga.
Ramspeck	Spence	White
Rankin	Starnes, Ala.	Whitten
Richards	Steagall	Whittington
Robertson	Stefan	Wickersham
Robinson, Utah	Stevenson	Winstead
Rowan	Stewart	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Sullivan	Worley
Sabath	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Sadowski	Talle	Zimmerman
Sasser	Tarver	
Sauthoff	Thomas, Tex.	

NAYS—175

Anderson, Calif. Hall,	Leonard W.	O'Neal
Andresen,	Hancock	Phillips
August H.	Harness, Ind.	Pittenger
Angell	Heldinger	Ploeser
Arends	Herter	Plumley
Arnold	Hess	Poulson
Auchincloss	Hill	Powers
Baldwin, Md.	Hinshaw	Pracht
Barrett	Hoffman	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mo.	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Bishop	Howell	Rizley
Blackney	Jeffrey	Rockwell
Bolton	Jenkins	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Rogers, Calif.
Buffett	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Busbey	Johnson,	Rohrbough
Butler	Anton J.	Rolph
Canfield	Johnson,	Rowe
Cannon, Mo.	Calvin D.	Schliffier
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Schuetz
Carter	Johnson,	Schwabe
Chenoweth	J. Leroy	Scott
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ward	Shafar.
Church	Jones	Short
Clason	Jonkman	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Kean	Smith, Maine
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Smith, Wis.
Compton	Kinzer	Springer
Crawford	Knutson	Stanley
Curtis	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Day	LaFollette	Stockman
Dewey	Lambertson	Sumner, Ill.
Dirksen	Landis	Sundstrom
Dondero	Lea	Taber
Durham	LeCompte	Talbot
Dworshak	Lewis, Ohio	Taylor
Ellis	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Tibbott
Elmer	McCowan	Towe
Elston, Ohio	McGregor	Troutman
Engel	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Fellows	McWilliams	Vursell
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Gale	Mason	Wasieleski
Gallagher	May	Welch, Ohio
Gavin	Morrow	Welch
Gearhart	Michener	West
Gerlach	Miller, Conn.	Wigglesworth
Gifford	Miller, Mo.	Willey
Gillette	Miller, Pa.	Wilson
Goodwin	Monkiewicz	Winter
Graham	Mott	Wolfenden, Pa.
Grant, Ind.	Mruk	Wolverton, N. J.
Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Newsome	
Gwynne	Norman	
Hale	Norrell	
Hall, Edwin	O'Brien, Ill.	
Arthur		

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Robison, Ky.

NOT VOTING—70

Allen, Ill.	Cochran	Fitzpatrick
Andrews	Costello	Ford
Baldwin, N. Y.	Courtney	Furlong
Barden	Culkin	Gamble
Barry	Cullen	Gavagan
Bates, Mass.	Dickstein	Gillie
Beall	Dies	Green
Beil	Ditter	Halleck
Boren	Douglas	Hare
Bradley, Mich.	Eaton	Hartley
Brehm	Eberharter	Hébert
Buckley	Elliot	Jarman
Cannon, Fla.	Ellsworth	Judd
Capozzoli	Fay	Kearney
Carlson, Kans.	Fish	Kilburn

King	Nichols	Simpson, Pa.
LeFevre	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tolan
Lynch	O'Leary	Treadway
McMillan	Philbin	Van Zandt
Maas	Ramey	Vinson, Ga.
Magnuson	Randolph	Wheat
Monroney	Rivers	Wolcott
Mundt	Satterfield	
Murray, Tenn.	Sheridan	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York, against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Andrews against.

Mr. Robison of Kentucky for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Douglas against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wheat against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

General pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Tolman with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. ROGERS of California, Mr. WENE, and Mr. HEIDINGER changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLOOM changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ROBISON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY. I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 69, line 12, strike out the remainder of line 12 after the figure down to and including the word "inclusive", in line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "To remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 87.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to what I am about to say.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to insist upon disagreement with Senate amendment No. 87 has been offered by me in behalf of the subcommittee with whom I have not had an opportunity to confer since the vote was had by the House agreeing to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 86. The position of the House, it seems to me, with regard to this amendment, if it should vote to insist upon its disagreement with Senate amendment No. 87, would be rather contradictory. Senate amendment No. 87 provides that this \$400,000,000—which was \$300,000,000 until the House accepted the Senate amendment—should be used only for payments for compliance with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended and eliminates, as I understand its meaning—that is if we disagree and the Senate accepts our position—it would eliminate payment of the amounts authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Secretary's announcement of December 5, 1942, for other than soil-conservation practices; in other words, you have now provided the money, \$400,000,000 for carrying out the program which he announced on December 5, 1942. If you now insist upon disagreeing to Senate amendment No. 87 you will be in the attitude of saying that you will provide the money but you will not allow it to be paid out for the purpose for which the Secretary announced it would be paid; so I am raising the question now for the interest of all the Members of the House as to whether they ought to further insist upon their disagreement to Senate amendment No. 87 or whether or not in compliance with the action you have just taken in agreeing to the \$400,000,000 you ought to agree to that amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I have a preferential motion which I will offer to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 87. Will not that take care of the situation?

Mr. TARVER. If the House takes that action, it seems to me, it would iron out a contradiction here because if you do not take that action you are in the position of appropriating \$400,000,000 to carry out the Secretary's program and then saying that half of the type of payments offered shall not be paid.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of offering this motion?

Mr. TARVER. I will be glad to. However, I simply want to call the attention of the House to the subject matter. I have offered the motion to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment, but I think the House should consider this matter carefully before it takes action.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. COOLEY: Mr. COOLEY moves to recede and concur in amendment No. 87.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to discuss the motion which I have just offered because it has been very intelligently discussed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first, let me ask about the parliamentary situation. I think the last motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina was a preferential motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. To recede and concur. A division of the question has been asked for by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 87, on which the vote will recur, is this: When the bill was before the House, the House provided that \$300,000,000 was to remain available until June 30, 1945, for programs under the A. A. A. Act of 1938 for soil-building practices and compliances and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation Act. If this language is taken out, of course, it opens up the whole proposition for any kind of payment they might want to make under the act of 1938, including the types of subsidies referred to earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The act to which the gentleman refers does not contain any provision regarding subsidies at all. It only authorizes the Secretary to make certain commitments within the purview of that legislative act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the essential point is that if the language as adopted by the House and stricken out by the Senate is preserved then the funds can be used only for the purpose of soil-building practices and compliances and water-conservation practices and nothing more.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. And less than \$300,000,000 will be required for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point is we are voting now on policy and not on money. If we recede on the policy adopted by the House the money that will be left over can revert to the Treasury and not be used.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Solicitor in the Department of Agriculture has ruled this soil-conservation money can be used for the payment of subsidies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman means the compliance money.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Whatever it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not under the language of the House. It was tied down so it could not be used for any subsidy purposes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina prevails, then the Secretary can use it for subsidies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. What is the gentleman's understanding of the Senate language?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate struck out the provision that the House put in which would limit it to soil-compliance practices, soil-building and water-conservation practices and nothing more.

Mr. PACE. And extends it how far?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until the 31st of December 1943.

Mr. PACE. It extends the use of the money for what purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The money will be used for any purposes then, that the Solicitor, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Administrator of the A. A. A. might interpret it could be used for under the original act, and I may say they have placed some very singular constructions on the language of that original act, notably that they can use \$125,000,000 for the type of incentive payments which was represented to us early in February.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not mean that the payments concerning which they testified in February are in any way involved in this appropriation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but the Secretary and the Solicitor did say they so interpreted the language of the act of 1938 that they could use the money under the original act for incentive purposes and this ties the thing down to soil conservation purposes.

Mr. TARVER. May I read the language inserted by the Senate for which the \$400,000,000 was provided in its version of the bill:

To remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive.

In other words, the Senate inserted language simply providing that these funds should be paid out in accordance with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and in accordance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It means, then, that if the Secretary or the Solicitor



makes an interpretation of the act of 1936 or 1938 to the effect that the money can be used for a subsidy or an incentive purpose, that, of course, is the construction that will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. I think they will be bound by the announcement which has already been made by the Secretary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that if the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted, the result will be that we will appropriate this year \$400,000,000 for the same purposes for which we appropriated this money last year, except that last year we appropriated \$450,000,000?

Mr. CASE. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. For exactly the same purposes, and it will be used in exactly the same manner?

Mr. CASE. Yes. There is nothing new up to this point. However, if we want to make a change for next year we should serve notice in advance. Furthermore, we should insist on retaining the House language in amendment No. 88, to prevent the use of any of the funds for incentive payments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The proper way to do it would be to insist on amendment No. 88 when we come to it.

Mr. CASE. Yes, I think that is correct. That is what I tried to point out earlier today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So there is no objection to agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to recede and concur and then insisting on the position of the House with respect to amendment No. 88?

Mr. CASE. In answer to that, let me say that the reason I asked for a division of the question is to make it possible, if the parliamentary situation permits, to give the House an opportunity to say that while we are going to take care of the commitments made last year this money shall not be used to make that kind of commitment again. Consequently, I propose to offer a limitation by a motion to concur with an amendment, which would add this language:

*Provided, however, That no part of the funds appropriated under this head will be available for expenditure to announce or prepare a program for payments in subsequent years other than for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended.*

The issue we have on the pending amendment is merely whether or not you want the money to be available for making the payments this year on the basis of the commitments that were made with the farmers last fall when they were signed up.

In proposing to concur in the amendment with an amendment—I am not sure

that it is in order, but if it is I propose to offer it—my purpose is to serve notice on the Secretary that he cannot use any of this money to set up a program for next year for anything other than the purely soil-conservation practices. That, as I get it, is what gentlemen have been advocating here today, except that they have wanted it retroactive. I am not opposed to reducing A. A. funds, but I am opposed to changing the rules of payment after a crop is planted.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I think that if the gentleman will look at the language stricken out by the Senate in its amendment No. 92, he will find that the objective he has in mind will be served by insisting on disagreement to the Senate action in striking out that language. In that connection I call his attention to the fact that Mr. Davis, in the statement I read to the House, did not raise any objection to the House language which the Senate struck out by its amendment No. 92. That language reads as follows:

*Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000.*

In other words, if the Senate amendment is rejected and this language remains in the bill it will limit the program next year to \$300,000,000 and also limit it to soil-conservation and water-conservation practices.

Mr. Davis said that it would be all right to do that for next year, but he said that it ought not to be done for this year after the program for this year had already been announced. So I hope the gentleman will not offer his amendment but that the House will insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 92, leaving that language in the bill, which ought to be sufficient for the gentleman's purposes.

Mr. CASE. If there is a clear understanding that money will not be used to set up the crop-adjustment payments for another year, I have no need to offer an amendment, but I want the language to be certain.

Mr. TARVER. I understand that that will be expressly provided if Senate amendment No. 92 is stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The only reason I felt that we ought to make the full payment this year is to provide what the farmers understood when they signed up—that they would receive both soil conservation and crop adjustment payments. If we serve notice on them that that is not to be the

case for next year, then we can consistently hold the money down. I do not know that \$300,000,000, for that matter, is necessary if you limit the payments to soil conservation. That might be reduced still further if only 187 or 200 million is needed for that part of the payment this year. But certainly we ought to serve notice on them in advance if a charge is to be made. With an understanding, then, that the Secretary understands that the limitation in the language which the gentleman from Georgia has cited puts a prohibition on next year's program and that he proposes to ask the House to stand by that language, I shall not insist on offering the language of my preferential motion at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the gentleman's understanding that his purpose can be promoted by adopting the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina and by agreeing to the views expressed by the gentleman from Georgia, so that the amendment will read for the current year just as it was for last year?

Mr. CASE. If I do not offer my amendment, then the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not use 5 minutes. I am as they say getting kind of sick and tired and fed up with a lot of loose and irresponsible talk by those who do not appreciate their responsibilities to the Government but take themselves too seriously.

I should like to tell my Republican friends that those who are inclined to vote for this as well as those who voted for the \$100,000,000 addition, and those who were not present or cared not to be present to vote are making a contribution to the Democratic campaign fund, as subsidies, to be used against them.

That is only a selfish reason why they should vote against subsidies as a principle which cannot be defended, never has justified itself, and has been repeatedly repudiated by Congress on both sides of the aisle.

I am surprised at the absence of some Members today who ought to be here to support our action at this time.

I am constrained to believe they must be for subsidies else they would have been here to support a committee which has tried to represent the position of the House, in the conference report.

I have no question to make as to their right to vote their convictions.

I do question their judgment as they failed to be here to vote against subsidies so insidiously involved in this subsidy proposal. That failure to be present to vote already has cost the taxpayers \$100,000,000 and that is a lot of money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 81, noes 110.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—166

Abernethy	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, La.	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	O'Konski
Beckworth	Hagen	O'Neal
Bland	Harris, Va.	O'Toole
Bonner	Hart	Outland
Boykin	Hays	Pace
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Patman
Brooks	Hobbs	Patton
Brown, Ga.	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Bryson	Hoeven	Pfeiffer
Bulwinkle	Hollifield	Price
Burch, Va.	Hope	Priest
Burchill, N. Y.	Hull	Rabaut
Burdick	Izac	Ramspeck
Burgin	Jackson	Rankin
Byrne	Johnson	Richards
Camp	Lyndon B.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Kee	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Sabath
Clark	Kelley	Sadowski
Coffee	Kennedy	Sauthoff
Colmer	Keogh	Scanlon
Cooley	Kerr	Schuetz
Cooper	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cox	Klein	Sikes
Cravens	Lane	Slaughter
Creal	Larcade	Snyder
Crosser	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	LeCompte	Sparkman
Curley	Lemke	Spence
Curtis	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
D'Alesandro	McCord	Steagall
Davis	McCormack	Sullivan
Dawson	McGehee	Tarver
Delaney	McGranery	Thomas, Tex.
Dilweg	McMillan	Thomason
Dingell	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Domengeaux	Madden	Voorhis, Calif.
Doughton	Mahon	Walter
Drewry	Maloney	Ward
Feighan	Manasco	Weaver
Fernandez	Mansfield	Weiss
Flannagan	Mont	Wene
Fogarty	Mansfield, Tex.	Whelchel, Ga.
Folger	Marcantonio	Whitten
Forand	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fulbright	Merritt	Wickersham
Fulmer	Mills	Winstead
Gathings	Morrison, La.	Woodrum, Va.
Gibson	Morrison, N. C.	Worley
Gilchrist	Murdoch	Wright
Gordon	Murphy	Zimmerman
Gore	Myers	
	Norton	

NAYS—177

Andersen	Cannon, Mo.	Elmer
H. Carl	Carson, Ohio	Elston, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Carter	Engel
Andersen	Chenoweth	Fellows
August H.	Chilperfield	Fenton
Angell	Church	Gale
Arends	Clason	Gallagher
Arnold	Clevenger	Gearhart
Auchincloss	Cole, Mo.	Gerlach
Barrett	Cole, N. Y.	Gifford
Bender	Compton	Gillette
Bennett, Mich.	Crawford	Goodwin
Bennett, Mo.	Day	Gossett
Bishop	Dewey	Graham
Blackney	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.
Bolton	Disney	Griffiths
Brown, Ohio	Dondero	Gross
Buffett	Durham	Gwynne
Busbey	Dworshak	Hale
Butler	Ellis	Hall
Canfield	Ellison, Md.	Edwin Arthur

Hall	Ludlow	Schiffier
Leonard W.	McCowan	Schwabe
Hancock	McGregor	Scott
Harness, Ind.	McLean	Shafer
Heldinger	McWilliams	Short
Hertter	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hess	Mason	Smith, Maine
Hill	May	Smith, Ohio
Hinshaw	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman	Michener	Springer
Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Conn.	Stanley
Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Nebr.	Stearns, N. H.
Horan	Miller, Pa.	Stefan
Howell	Monkiewicz	Stevenson
Jeffrey	Mott	Stockman
Jenkins	Mruk	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Murray, Wis.	Summers, Tex.
Jensen	Newsome	Sundstrom
Johnson	Norman	Taber
Anton J.	Norrell	Talbot
Johnson	O'Hara	Taylor
Calvin D.	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips	Tibbott
Johnson	Pittenger	Towe
J. Leroy	Ploeser	Troutman
Johnson, Ward	Plumley	Vorsy, Ohio
Jones	Poage	Vursell
Jonkman	Poulson	Wadsworth
Kean	Powers	Wasielewski
Keefe	Pracht	Welch, Ohio
Kilday	Reece, Tenn.	Welch
Kinzer	Reed, Ill.	West
Kieberg	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Willey
Kunkel	Rizley	Wilson
LaFollette	Rockwell	Winter
Lambertson	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Landis	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Lanham	Rohrbough	Woodruff, Mich.
Lewis, Ohio	Rolph	
Luce	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Robson, Ky.

NOT VOTING—87

Allen, Ill.	Fay	Miller, Mo.
Andrews	Fish	Monroney
Baldwin, Md.	Fisher	Mundt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Ford	Nichols
Barry	Furlong	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	O'Leary
Beall	Gavagan	Philbin
Bell	Gavin	Ramey
Bloom	Gillie	Randolph
Boren	Green	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Brehm	Hare	Rowan
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Sasser
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Ark.	Satterfield
Capozzoli	Hartley	Sheridan
Carlson, Kans.	Hébert	Simpson, Pa.
Cochran	Heffernan	Smith, Va.
Costello	Jarman	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Johnson	Stewart
Culkin	Luther A.	Talle
Cullen	Judd	Tolan
Dickstein	Kearney	Treadway
Dies	Kilburn	Van Zandt
Ditter	Kling	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	LeFevre	Wheat
Eaton	Lynch	White
Eberhart	McKenzie	Wolcott
Elliot	Maas	
Ellsworth	Magnuson	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Andrews against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Robson of Kentucky for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Douglas against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Furlong for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Wolcott against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wheat against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

General pairs:

Mr. Eberhart with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Tolman with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Talle.

Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. SASSCER. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY. If he were present he would vote "aye." I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 69, line 24, strike out lines 24 and 25 and on page 70 strike out down to and including the words "incentive payment."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 88.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language stricken by the Senate, insert "Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments, if and so long as such payments are under any law or Executive order taken into consideration in the determination by the Price Administrator, or other authority, of the maximum or ceiling or parity prices of farm commodities."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.



Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House a few weeks ago the following amendment was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] and was adopted and written into the bill:

*Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.*

When the bill went to the Senate this proviso was stricken. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tarver] has moved that the House insist on the amendment, and my proposal is a substitute for that amendment. The difference between us is that my amendment would permit incentive payments, provided they are not taken into consideration and deducted from the maximum or ceiling price established for the commodity.

I supported the Cannon amendment when it was first offered. I spoke in favor of it, and I did so because, having no other alternative at the time, I wanted to register my complete disapproval of the present practice of the administration and the Office of Price Administration, when fixing ceiling prices on farm commodities, of deducting from the parity price all payments, soil building, parity, incentive, and all others, paid to the farmers.

I suppose you understand how it works. For example, they have set up a program for this year under which they promise to pay the cotton farmers 1½ cents per pound on the normal yield of their allotted acreage, provided the farmer will plant so many acres of peanuts. That part of it is not so bad, as peanuts are a vital war crop. But, and here is the trouble, when they go to fix the ceiling price on cotton they insist on deducting this 1½ cents from the price of cotton. Although the farmer has gone to the extra expense of buying more machinery for peanuts, high-priced seed, and so forth, and has done everything requested of him, he has the money paid him for doing those things taken away when he goes to sell his crop.

They propose to do exactly the same thing to the wheat growers, the corn growers, and many others. It is no more than a common fraud and a gross misrepresentation to the farmers. They are led to believe they will receive certain payments if they cooperate in certain respects, obey the regulations, control their production, incur additional expense, and then find out when they go to sell their crop every penny paid to them is being deducted from the price of the crops they sell.

I cannot be a party to, and I do not think you want to be a party to fooling the farmers of this Nation, and that is what my amendment seeks to prevent. I think it would be very unfortunate if this House should take the definite position that we are not going, under any circumstances, to make incentive payments. You are going to need incentive payments, and need them badly. For example, you have today thousands of farmers growing flaxseed for the first time in their lives, growing soybeans, and growing peanuts and other war crops. They do not know how deep to

plant the seed. They have to buy new machinery to cultivate them with. They do not know how to harvest them and they are going to have poor crops and poor yields. Is it wrong in this critical hour to go to those people and say, "If you go to this additional expense, if you produce the crops so badly needed to win the war, we will pay you an incentive for doing it?" You are doing it with Irish potatoes today and I have not heard anybody complain about that. You are paying them \$50 for each extra acre. Every Irish-potato grower in the United States this year will get \$50 an acre extra for his extra acreage. Why? Because they have had to expand their crop, because people are growing them who never grew them before. They have to buy additional machinery. The potatoes are needed badly, and the Government has said to the Irish-potato producers, "We will pay you \$50 an acre extra for every additional acre of Irish potatoes you grow this year." That is the smart thing to do, provided after a man has incurred the expense and has suffered losses, you let him keep the \$50. I supported the Cannon amendment because I am not going to be a party to telling farmers in my State or in your State, "Yes, I will give you 5 cents a bushel on corn, or 12 cents a bushel on wheat, if you plant so many soybeans and flaxseed," and then when he sells his corn, take that 5 cents away from him by fixing the ceiling price on corn at 5 cents under the parity price.

That is one of the reasons corn is not moving today, because the corn producers of this Nation see the rank injustice that has been visited upon them. That is one reason you have a shortage of corn. It is not because it is not in the Nation. It is in storage; but the corn producers of this Nation know it is a damnable outrage that they have been paid this little payment in order to do things, and then when they move their corn to market they are told, "We are going to take it from your price. We have given you a nickel in one pocket and will now take it out of the other."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would not the net effect be to write into the law the real provisions of the so-called Pace-Bankhead bill?

Mr. PACE. Not the Pace bill. I wish I could.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not the Pace bill, but the Bankhead bill which was vetoed? Would that not be the net effect?

Mr. PACE. Only partly. My amendment says this: "That the farmer is entitled to parity price in the market place." My amendment sees that he gets it. Then if he makes an additional sacrifice, if he is to increase production and incur additional expenses to produce a crop that has never been produced before and suffers losses, then you can make him an incentive payment to do

that. It is exactly what you are doing with Irish potatoes today. What are you facing on Irish potatoes? You are facing a situation when your Irish potatoes move to market, of having this \$50 an acre deducted from your price and cut it down below parity. Do you think that that should be done after you have persuaded the farmer to plant his acreage and produce a crop, then say, when he comes to market, "We are going to take it out of your price"? They say, "We gave you \$50 an acre, but when you move to market we are going to take it away from you." This House should now go on record, in this critical hour in our Nation's food supply, against any such practices. My amendment relates only to incentive payments, which is the only subject before us at this time, while the Bankhead bill, which was vetoed, related to all such payments, parity payments, soil-building payments, as well as incentive payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The incentive payment in your amendment—

Mr. PACE. It is quite different from subsidies.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know the feature, but it only applies, as you illustrated it by the potato crop—that incentive applies only to the extra acreage planted?

Mr. PACE. The increased production for war purposes, yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that the incentive payment would not be included in figuring parity?

Mr. PACE. That is right and I am quite sure the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I supported the previous motion of the gentleman from Georgia, but in this instance the natural consequence is that there would be an immediate increase in the cost of living.

Mr. PACE. Oh, no, no. The gentleman has it exactly reversed. My amendment would increase production, give you a greater supply, and help reduce the cost of living.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. I think the present practice is reducing production; is preventing the expanded production that we need. I think the farmers of this Nation are entitled to fair parity prices, fairly administered. Then if you must go further to get expanded production that costs you twice as much as the normal crop, then you should offer incentives to produce that extra crop. It would not increase the cost of living. As it is now there will be no incentive payments, nothing to deduct from parity prices in establishing ceiling prices and very little increase in production, while if you authorize incentive payments and do not deduct them in fixing prices, there will be

no change or increase in the price, but a greatly increased production.

I do not think the roll-back and subsidy program of the O. P. A. is authorized by law. If you will read the Price Control Act, which is the only law on the subject, it authorizes the Office of Price Administration to pay subsidies to producers. Nowhere in the act or in any law that I have been able to find is anyone authorized to subsidize a processor. But the law expressly authorizes, in order to increase production, the payment of a subsidy to a producer. The incentive payment is the increased production method of getting the crops we need.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Suppose we adopt the gentleman's motion, is there any money in this bill that could be used for the purpose of paying incentive payments?

Mr. PACE. Oh, that is a different question. I do not think this House should go on record definitely and finally as saying that we shall not pay incentive payments, because I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas that I think next year this Nation is going to face a most frightful situation on food, and we will regret it.

Mr. HOPE. I think we can meet that situation when we reach it.

Mr. PACE. If the Congress will authorize reasonable incentive payments for the necessary increase in war crops and prevent these payments from being later deducted from the farmer's price, and will provide sufficient funds for the various price-support programs now being carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation, we will not need any roll-backs or subsidies but will place the War Food Administrator and the farmers of the Nation in position to produce the crops and provide the food so necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and proper morale on the home front.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is very little I want to say about this amendment, except to say that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] very freely confessed that indirectly it was writing into the law, through the instrumentality of an appropriation bill, the so-called Bankhead bill which was full of controversy when it was here, full of controversy when it was in the Senate, was vetoed by the President, and came back to us and was finally pigeon-holed in the Senate.

Now would it not be bad practice to try to spell out all of the implications of this amendment? I say, from the contents of the language submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, that I could not completely spell out all of the implications contained therein. That would require some careful study.

He says no funds shall be used for incentive payments unless or so long as they are deducted from ceiling prices and parity prices. I think that is a fair summary of them. How are you going to put

that on? Negatively you are invalidating the language that we wrote into this very act when we said that no money shall be used for incentive payments because he says none of the money shall be used for incentive payments, as long as they are used for a certain purpose. In other words, in a left-handed way you are putting the approval of the House upon the use of money for incentive payments unless it violates this question of deductions from the ceiling price and deductions from the calculations of the parity price. I do not propose to go along with that kind of a prolix move.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I am at a loss to understand what the effect would be, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment. It simply would be a limitation on any funds in this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. HOPE. In its operation, and I am not aware that there are any funds in this bill that could be used for incentive payments, inasmuch as the House has refused to recede and concur in the Senate amendment discussed just previous to this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true, but on the other hand the House has increased the amount of funds in this particular section by \$100,000,000, and suppose they can be used for those purposes, as the Solicitor and the Secretary of Agriculture have told us they could use them for incentive payments; that is what they stated to the subcommittee in February. If that is the case, then there might be \$100,000,000 in this bill that could be used for that particular purpose.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think, however, that under the language contained in the House bill, limiting those funds to compliance with soil-building and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotments Act, that any of this \$400,000,000 could be used for such incentive payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under that language, no; but we will not have completed action on this bill and will not have completed this section, no matter what we do on the amendments that will be offered on this disagreement since we are still going to be faced with that situation and the whole thing is up in the air. This section still requires Senate action and further House action, and one cannot at this time predict what provisions will be finally adopted.

Mr. HOPE. I am in agreement with the gentleman and I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, but I still do not see that it will have any effect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may not.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent from the suddenness of this amendment that very few of us realize just what the amendment will

accomplish. Certainly I have no knowledge as to the implications of the amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made his contribution. The gentleman from Illinois follows very closely all matters coming before the Appropriations Committee, and it is very apparent to me that he is uncertain; he was confused, and I know that some of the sentiments he expressed here represent my own thoughts at this moment. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] frankly admitted that by indirection he is trying to accomplish something that has already been attempted by direction and which the President has vetoed. Of course, no one knows, if this amendment is adopted and should finally stay in the bill, what action the President will take, but some day some President is going to veto an appropriation bill when a rider is put on that proposes to amend the law, but one thing is certain, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is an indirect way to try to accomplish what the Bankhead bill undertook to do and which bill, the President vetoed.

There are several reasons why I think those who represent agricultural districts should vote against this amendment. First, the fact that if it is adopted there is always the threat of a veto hanging over it. Second, the fact that no one of us knows what this amendment accomplishes, what it does or what its results will be. Certainly I do not think the House should legislate under circumstances such as exist here where we have an amendment offered by one who is not a member of the committee in charge of the bill and no member of the committee undertakes to express any thought on it.

If some member of the subcommittee or the conference committee made a motion to recede and concur with an amendment at least we would know that that Member was conversant with the subject and could convey to the House some information as to just what would result if the amendment were adopted. Even if you or I disagreed with his position we would have some sound premise upon which to think and to legislate, but this amendment leads us entirely into the field of uncertainty. I think under these circumstances the wise thing for us to do would be to defeat the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I hope the gentleman will accept my assurance that there is nothing uncertain about the amendment. It simply states that if a farmer is paid an incentive to increase production he can get the money in his pocket.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand; I have read the amendment, but the gentleman has admitted that indirectly he is trying to accomplish what the Bankhead bill did by direction, which bill has been vetoed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] frankly admits that he has no



knowledge as to what the results will be. With all due respect to the opinions of my friend from Georgia I am frank in stating that I have no knowledge about how this amendment will work if it should be adopted.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who certainly thinks clearly on agricultural matters, expresses uncertainty by the questions he asked of the gentleman from Illinois. I feel that under these circumstances and the uncertainty of the House as to what this amendment will do, coupled with the fact that the President has already vetoed a bill which had the same objective, the wise thing for the House to do is to defeat this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there need be no confusion, misunderstanding, or misapprehension about this amendment. In addition to the objections which have been advanced by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts, there are two considerations which have not yet been referred to, both of which stand out as clear as crystal.

The first is that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] reduces the House provision from a positive prohibition to a contingent prohibition. As it stands, the House prohibition is absolute. Under it there can be no incentive payments from funds carried by this bill.

But the proposition of the gentleman from Georgia is to make it prohibitive under circumstances and nonproductive under other circumstances. Under certain conditions it is effective and under other conditions it is wholly ineffective.

The House language is unequivocal. On a ye and nay vote the House by a two-thirds majority voted to proscribe incentive payments. The House is opposed to incentive payments and the country is opposed to incentive payments. But here is a proposal to weaken the prohibition against incentive payments and under circumstances probable of realization defeat the will of the House. On that ground alone the amendment ought to be rejected.

The second consideration, while not discussed here this afternoon, was indirectly referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]. The House proposition against incentive payments, as it stands, is a prohibition against the expenditure of money. No money shall be expended in incentive payments. It is a retrenchment of expenditure. It is a proposition to save money. It protects the Treasury. It protects the taxpayers. On the other hand, the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Georgia is a proposition to spend money, a proposition to increase expenditures. On a contingency it proposes to pay incentive payments which shall not be counted in estimating parity.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Is not my amendment also a proposition to get something to eat?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On the contrary, economists are agreed that it will in the end restrict production. That is one of the reasons the farm organizations are opposed to incentive payments.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia would be to add to the cost to the consumer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The answer to the gentleman's question is obvious.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in the last minute I have that this amendment is acceptable to no one. The farmers do not want it. The President does not want it. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has indicated, the consumers do not want it. The committee does not want it. The farm organizations do not want it. Strangely enough, even the Department does not want it. And by a decisive roll call, the House indicated it did not want it. This time it ought to be unanimous.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment may again be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment may again be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language stricken by the Senate, insert "Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments if and so long as such payments are under any law or Executive order taken into consideration in the determination by the Price Administrator or other authority of the maximum or ceiling or parity prices of farm commodities."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language which the Senate has stricken and to which the motion relates may also be read.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes, 34, noes 150.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that it may be in order to suspend now further consideration of the conference report and resume its consideration tomorrow.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, may I ask the majority leader about the change in the legislative program for tomorrow and Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow consideration of the conference report which was not completed today will continue. Following that there will be consideration of the last deficiency bill. I am hoping that on Thursday we will be able to take up the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That will not come up before Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It will not come up tomorrow.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three different subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter relating to N. Y. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech of a constituent of mine. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will amount to \$99. I ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 28, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a speech made by General Marshall at Columbia, Ohio, on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an article by the Honorable W. D. Jamieson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by Mr. Walter Wanger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S RIGHT HAND KNOWS NOT WHAT HIS LEFT HAND DOES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in Columbus, Ohio, the Governor of my State, Tom Dewey, made what I would term a purely political speech. He sought to advance his own political cause by criticism which I would say was carping. He joins the myopic league of grippers and the belly-achers against the Government. If ever there was a man as far as I know him—and I think I know him fairly well from his works and his words in New York—who is enchanted with his own importance, it is Governor Dewey. I would say that he surveys himself daily in the mirror and says to himself, "Would I not make a great President?"

Yesterday at Columbus, Ohio, Governor Dewey could not resist the temptation of having his little say about our National Government and at the same time, if I might say, tooting his own tin horn.

He talked of avoiding surrender to the failures of the National Government. He talked of the incredible deficiencies of the National Government. He talked of not waiting forever for Washington

to discover the laws of economics. He talked of not retiring to an ivory tower to invent something new and different.

A mighty man is he, so he says, but lacking the perspicacity to see that he cannot revile in one clause and praise in another if credence is to be given to any part of his statement. New York State solved the farm manpower shortage, but, he admits, with the aid of the United States Employment Service and—I quote—

In cooperation with the Farm Security Administration, we have brought additional permanent workers into the State.

If that is not surrendering to the failure of the National Government, what is? We might entitle his entire talk Success Through Failures. In view of his heavy scorn for the deficiencies of our National Government, I cannot resist the temptation to quote Mr. Dewey again:

All this was done by the process of collaboration between all farm groups and Federal, State, and local agencies.

It is truly incredible how one man in the same breath and in the same paragraph can talk of the failures of National Government and then state—again the obliging quotation:

We have found that there are enough men in Washington whose primary concern is to get the job done so that we have had many examples of fine cooperation.

We are grateful to Mr. Dewey for his reassurance.

Gasoline shortages were corrected by the Office of Petroleum Administration, and in negotiation for the necessary bottoms in the matter of grain from Canada, "we are receiving the most sympathetic cooperation from Chester Davis." So what are these failures?

No purpose would be served he said—in analyzing the incredible deficiencies of the National Government in its 10-year campaign to restrict food production in the United States.

Not Mr. Dewey's purpose, certainly. Mr. Dewey does not choose to remember that the act authorizing the establishment of the Federal Farm Bureau likewise authorized it to restrict planting of unnecessary crops. That was in 1930 under Mr. Hoover's administration—a Republican administration. The restrictive program, it is implied by Mr. Dewey, was the result of New Deal thinking. In 1930 the Federal Farm Bureau viewing the desirability of restricted and planned crop planting sent its men about the farms in an effort to persuade the farmers to cease planting crops of which there existed a surplus, namely, cotton, wheat, and tobacco. The program, it is true, was informal, but viewed during the Hoover Administration as economically sound. I might say in passing that Mr. Hoover's statement that land planting since 1932 has been reduced 47,000,000 acres did not take into account that a considerable fraction of this acreage was devoted to cotton, of which we still have a huge surplus and that a good part

of the remainder was marginal land which should never have been brought under the plow. Even Mr. Dewey admits we have wheat in goodly supply.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. With reference to that 47,000,000 acres, I can say to the gentleman that the wheat acreage since 1933 has been reduced to 55,000,000 acres at the present time.

Mr. CELLER. I do not doubt that some of the so-called new dealers caused some of that reduction, but I want to say that the whole idea of reduction of crops is not to be laid at the door of the Roosevelt administration in its entirety; that the matter started with Hoover.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can tell the gentleman, too, that I was here at the time and there was no reduction in the farm acreage during the so-called Federal Farm Bureau—the gentleman should have said "Board," because the Farm Bureau was not a creation of the Congress.

Mr. CELLER. I am sorry; I will accept that correction. I meant Federal Farm Board; not Bureau.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There were no reductions under that except that the farmers reduced themselves.

Mr. CELLER. I did say that it was more or less advisory, but the idea did stem from the Hoover administration to reduce the amount of acreage under the plow.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is pretty far-fetched.

Mr. CELLER. I must take exception to the gentleman's statement when he says it is far-fetched. There is no doubt that the whole idea originated at the time that Mr. Hoover was in the Presidency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that Governor Dewey made some reference to the very fine work done by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. CELLER. He made reference to the fine work done by almost a dozen different agencies in one breath, and then, in another breath, he tried to strike them down in toto, strike down the entire administration. He did that for his own selfish political self-aggrandizement.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observation I meant to make is that that agency will not be able to continue unless the House concurs tomorrow in the motion that will be made to enable that agency to continue to some extent effectively during the next fiscal year.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.



Mr. PLUMLEY. I should like to add this, for the reason that it was set up as an emergency agency. We were told long ago that when these emergencies ceased to exist the administration would undertake to correct and get rid of a lot of these things. Now, Mr. Dewey may have put his finger on the right thing.

Mr. CELLER. It may be that he put his finger on the right thing as far as giving us a handle with which to whip him is concerned. He did that all right, beyond peradventure of a doubt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the same kind of a licking you gave him in New York last election?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Or any other time he has ever been before the people?

Mr. CELLER. I assure you I had no part in that. If we had had our way in New York, "we," who have a little more wisdom in that regard, he would not have been Governor of our State.

Mr. Dewey pours his wrath on O. P. A. Of course, O. P. A. must bear the onus of guilt, says he. O. P. A. has yet to discover the laws of economics, Mr. Dewey tells us. Does he mean the law of supply and demand, a laissez faire policy, particularly in times of war with each man for himself, as the elephant said dancing among the chickens, and devil take the hindmost? Follow the law of supply and demand and never mind about the equities of price control and rationing. Let those who have the money for necessities do the buying and as for those who have not, "let them eat the cake."

This morning I read this headline in the paper:

Vast supplies of cattle are piling up and meat famine gets worse—

Meaning the meat famine in New York City. The subheading is:

If half the excess was slaughtered it would supply 200,000,000 persons with beef for a year exclusive of military needs.

That is the assertion of various heads of the ranchmen's associations. Governor Dewey says naught about the resistance of the cattle bloc and these ranchmen against placing a ceiling on cattle prices on the hoof to cut the cost of living to New Yorkers in his own State. He dare not offend the cattle bloc. They have many votes in a Republican national convention.

Be it remembered that it was the policy of the Department of Agriculture that early in the war increased the price of hogs in order to encourage the raising and fattening of them. Mr. Dewey sees corn only in relation to hogs. Raise the ceiling on corn and you must necessarily raise the ceiling on dairy products, poultry, milk, and eggs. Certainly raising the ceiling on corn would in no way release the meat since the farmers would still withhold the corn for feeding and fattening their hogs, fearing that prices on hogs would still advance, but I fear you cannot get that into the skull of Mr. Dewey. It is Mr. Dewey, I am afraid,

that reduces the problem to simplicities, a problem that can only be ultimately solved by the farmers, the cattle growers, and the Department of Agriculture, and the O. P. A. working together.

There is no use of trying to fling epithets at each other, they must sit down around the table and work out this intricate problem. It can be done, but it cannot be done if we have carping critics like Governor Dewey.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the trouble. The gentleman puts his finger right on the trouble. The O. P. A. refuses to sit down and talk it over with men who are experienced in the business. They call them in to Washington but they tell them what they are going to do to them.

Mr. CELLER. Let me say this in answer, and then I will yield further. I do not think that is quite a reflection of what O. P. A. is doing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But it is.

Mr. CELLER. They have called in men who are interested, businessmen and others, but when you have all these various blocs and organizations pulling in every conceivable direction they cannot have the interests of the public at heart. It is most difficult not to yield under such dreadful pressure. They all want to batten and feast at the expense of the tragedy of the war. O. P. A. is almost powerless.

Mr. CELLER. And we now have a man in Mr. Prentiss Brown, who wants to do a good job. Give him a chance, do not unduly criticize, do not castigate him at all times.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Here we stand with 79,000,000 head of cattle, which is the largest supply in the history of the country, and with 125,000,000 pigs, which is high, and you will go hungry next winter in New York.

Mr. CELLER. Why?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because the distribution system has broken down in the country as the result largely of the O. P. A., and unwise regulations.

Mr. CELLER. I say it is due in part to the selfish interests who are holding back the slaughtering of that cattle, and they should not hold it back, if they are patriotic. They are holding the slaughtering back for higher prices. If half that surplus of cattle were slaughtered, they would have enough beef to supply 200,000,000 people, regardless of the Army and the Navy, and it is proof positive that the cattle bloc in the first place does not want to put a limit price on the hoof, they want to get higher prices, and the highest prices that they can command for their goods, and to my mind, especially during these perilous times, that is tragic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman should not charge the farmers and others with being unpatriotic, because they are serving a useful purpose in helping to win the war.

Mr. CELLER. I do not mean the individual little farmer, but some of the larger groups. I probably should revise my remarks so as not to put the onus on them. I did not mean to be all-embracing in that regard.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know of any farm bloc in Congress?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, I am not going to belabor that point. You know there is a farm bloc.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to something that happened today. Our friends from the city today voted a subsidy of \$100,000,000 the boys in the House had passed before and that is supposed to trickle down into the pockets of the farmers, and the big majority of the Representatives here from the rural sections voted against it. So it seems to me that there is much more of a political bloc than a farm bloc or any other kind of a bloc.

Mr. CELLER. We were led to believe it would help the farmers. We voted for it and I voted for it with an idea that it would help the farmers, and I think we are helping them if the soil conservation program will be properly administered and nobody tries to put a broomstick between the legs of those who are trying to administer the law. We in the city have always endeavored to help the farmers. We have the interest of the farmer at heart. We have never denied the farmer his due, but when it comes to trying to cut down prices for the average housewife in the city, we do not get the reciprocity that we are entitled to from the members in the rural sections.

Mr. McCORMACK. The vote today would seem to indicate that those who represent the city are much better friends of the farmers than those who represent the farming districts.

Mr. CELLER. That is a very wise statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just stated he wanted to help the farmers. Were you helping them when you went with the teamsters' union and prohibited the bringing of produce in there so that you could get something to eat without the payment of \$8.60 for a little truck and \$9.40 for the big truck?

Mr. CELLER. I am afraid the gentleman is too strong a labor baiter for me to understand his statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. CELLER. What is untrue?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That I am a labor baiter.

Mr. CELLER. I do not hesitate to say that the gentleman has never been a friend of labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. The gentleman doesn't have any more understanding of that than of the farm

proposition. All he understands is the needle trade.

Mr. CELLER. That is a little unfair, that sort of argument.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the same sort of argument you make here.

Mr. CELLER. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] repeatedly brings up this matter of the teamsters in the city of New York and he should be made to learn that in the city of New York every possible facility has been worked out for the farmers markets, and for protection for the farmers to bring their produce there. If there was any hesitancy on the part of law enforcement agencies with regard to the teamsters, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] should remember that there was a decision by the Supreme Court that bound all of the law-enforcement agencies on that question. But as far as the farmers are concerned, those who come into the city of New York, all of their organizations endorse the type of marketing administration that we have in the city of New York. They are given full protection and every possible consideration.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman speaks truly indeed. As far as the violence of some of the members of the teamsters' union, the so-called local in that area, of New York is concerned, I criticized them most severely for their activities. Daniel Tobin, international president of the Teamsters' Union, did likewise. If the gentleman would read the minority report on the Hobbs bill he will see that I did not hesitate to denounce the actions of the members of that local union.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Every one of those racketeers has been prosecuted and sent to jail. There is not one of them around in New York City today. That is, in any manner hounding the farmers or any other group that does business in the various markets.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was that done by Tom Dewey?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He did some of it. He is entitled to credit. I do not deny giving him credit. But he could not have done anything if there had not been an honest mayor of the city of New York in the person of Fiorello LaGuardia.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to state food inflation cannot be controlled by rationing, roll-back, subsidies, and ceiling prices on food generally, but to leave free the price of cattle on the hoof, that is like filling a bag, open at two ends. You cannot control unless you control all along the line—wages and prices of cattle as well. We control wages, but for example we do not control the price of cattle on the hoof. That is the open bag at the wrong end.

Governor Dewey says nothing of the weight of the hog that plays so important a part, or the discouraging of the fattening of beef animals or the role of

Chester Davis in raising the price of hogs. The details are too difficult for Mr. Dewey to assimilate. It is simpler to throw it on O. P. A. which continues in its struggle to hold the line. Mr. Dewey apparently is not worried about that line or the ultimate consumer. He is clever enough not to offend the farm or cattle bloc. We have these vast quantities of beef and pork, but the growers refuse to release the supply. If Governor Dewey had the courage he would demand a ceiling price on the hoof, and in a way force beef and pork to the seaboard. But he is too skillful a politician.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

#### NEW DEAL FAILURES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] should spend so much time delivering a speech which sounds as though it was written by the prize smear artist, Charley Michelson, criticizing Governor Dewey. It is apparent that Governor Dewey delivered what the gentleman from New York considers might be a knock-out blow to the New Deal. Because Tom Dewey has time and again floored the New Deal in the city and State of New York, every effort will be made to discredit him. It may be, too, that envy and jealousy have some part in inducing the gentleman to speak.

His attention is called to the fact that envy and jealousy are prone to create a state of mind that is apt to lead men, as he evidently was led, into extravagant and exaggerated statements. His attitude seems to be that it is unpatriotic for anyone to criticize the New Deal. That is the customary, the narrow and the unfair method adopted by the warmongers, the internationalists, the new dealers and the fourth-term advocates. That method is no longer effective. Its advocates have overworked it. No longer do the people listen to the cry that their neighbors, whom they well know to be loyal and patriotic, are disloyal.

Throughout the country is growing the feeling that many of those who use that method of smear in lieu of argument have something which they, themselves, wish to conceal. More and more when people hear the cry of fire, they begin to look

around to see if the smoke is not coming from the squawker himself.

New York, while it is still the tail, is no longer the tail that wags the dog. The city of New York, much to its chagrin, has found that it is dependent upon the great Middle West for the food it eats from day to day. New York, which in days gone by was prone to tell us how to conduct our daily affairs and how to live, to tell us when we could and when we could not, at its rate of interest have a loan, has now learned that it is no longer the master of the financial and industrial policies of the great producing Middle West and as is usual with those long accustomed to wielding unmerited power in a tyrannical manner, now begins to whine about the treatment received from those it has so long attempted to dominate.

Republicans are not the only ones who are criticizing the New Deal. The severest, the most biting, the most devastating criticism of the New Deal comes from Democrats. As an illustration, look at the first page of the morning Times-Herald, the caption reads, "Democrat Senators cite peril to home-front war effort—Five charge bungling of vital defense tasks by administration." That caption refers to the report of five Democratic Members of the other body and among the charges are the following:

#### LAG IN PRODUCTION CITED

1. Government spokesmen have developed no clear policies to integrate the various agencies dealing with economic stabilization, and procedure has been "by groping, tentative steps by hemming and hawing, by half-way measures."

2. The Nation is plagued by recurring strikes and administrative failure to attack the roots of unrest.

3. There has never been a genuine requirements committee to coordinate military, lend-lease and civilian requirements.

4. Production is not up to capacity, but despite the clamor for greater production, huge stock piles of war materials lie unused.

5. The approach to the manpower problem has been "a monotonous series of piecemeal and groping measures."

6. There is no policy as to subsidies, regarding which there is disagreement among the various agencies and within the ranks of the individual agencies.

7. Gasoline shortages due to distribution problems disrupt transportation of war workers and war goods and hamper production, while Government agencies offer only the prospect of more shortages. Meanwhile railroad labor and management have testified that supplies of oil for the petroleum-starved Eastern States might be tripled by effective use of the railroads.

The report further states:

With the country in the grip of a coal strike the Senators found: "We are plagued by recurring strikes and by administrative failure to attack the root causes of unrest. \* \* \* Recent labor unrest is more significant as a symptom rather than a cause of disorganization on the home front. In 1942 and in the first 4 months of 1943 one-twentieth of 1 percent of total labor time was lost through strikes."

"Inefficient control and direction of production cause manpower losses several hundred-fold greater. Willful, knowing, and deliberate retardation of production of critical material by industry, labor, or Government agency during war is, in fact, treasonable. But



neither threats of compulsion nor exhortation can substitute for a rational organization of the domestic front."

It is doubtful if any Republican ever said more along that line.

But that is not all. Not long ago a distinguished Member of the other body, a Democrat, exasperated by the justifiable complaints of his constituents wrote a letter in which, among other things, he said:

That the responsible officials were "taking orders from somebody and that what they are doing is only part of a plot to change our Government into communism, socialism, or some other foreign isms which means a dictatorship and regimentation of our people and abolishing our private system of enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include these statements to which I will make reference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Governor Dewey evidently, obviously, as did those of the opposite political faith who have just been quoted, rendered a patriotic service when he directed attention to just a few of the policies of this administration which are interfering with production and with the war effort itself.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In that very speech he praises highly the various departments under the New Deal administration, so if he praises those very departments, how can the gentleman come to the conclusion that he is reviling the administration?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Governor Dewey was not reviling the administration. He was calling attention to a few, a very few of its destructive actions. Of course, it is difficult for the gentleman from New York to understand what the New Deal with its spending of the billions of dollars, and in all this expenditure, with the hundreds of thousands of employees, I say, it may be difficult for the gentleman from New York to find any fault with anything that the New Deal has done, or is doing, but if memory serves me correctly it has not been 3 months since the gentleman from New York took one of the departments of the New Deal administration down the stretch and called its administrators practically everything they could be called in parliamentary language.

It makes a difference, apparently, when the gentleman from New York is criticizing the New Deal. That is one of the things that some of us object to. But we retain the right to criticize. The gentleman is in the same situation as the mother with a spoiled child who objects to anyone calling attention to its dirty face, its purloining ways, but who wants to keep all criticism under cover at home, who wants to do its own washing of the dirty face, but inasmuch as we are an essential part of this Government, inasmuch as we have to answer for the dirty face, the destructive ways of the way-

ward child, we reserve the right to criticize.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct that I did criticize one of the departments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will say you did. That is when it interfered with the needleworkers' trade, you were very ready to criticize.

Mr. CELLER. No, my criticism had nothing to do with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right for once. It was another gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] who as I recall was speaking for the garment workers who referred to the needle workers. You were talking about the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and speaking for the manufacturers of cheap jewelry, when you wanted the silver for them.

Mr. CELLER. It had nothing to do with the use of silver. It was purely a matter that had nothing whatsoever to do with anybody in my district, none of my constituents. I felt that the man who was in charge of the civilian branch of the War Production Board was not doing his duty by civilians, and that is what I criticized, but because I cannot agree with one branch I do not say everything is bad, everything is black.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I remember you were speaking in support of your amendment to a Treasury Department appropriation bill and your amendment as you stated would preclude the expenditure of any of the appropriations under that bill for the carrying out of provisions of the Silver Purchase Act. I do not know what you put in the Record, but I do know, for I heard you, that you certainly characterized in no polite or laudatory manner some department officials. I will say this to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on the doctrine of chance alone, because of the multiplicity of its acts, there must be something good in the New Deal, it could not possibly all be bad. The planners have done their darnedest and I may not use a more emphatic word—they have done their darnedest—as a Member at the other end of the Capitol said, to establish a dictatorship and to bring about communism, fascism, or some other form of foreignism. That they have not succeeded is not due to any fault of theirs.

In the same issue of the Washington Times-Herald of June 22, but in another column at the top in bold black-face type appears this lead: "Nelson pledges early relief on gas ban in East." Then appears the statement:

War Production Chief Donald M. Nelson said yesterday that Government officials are resolving differences over the critical east coast gasoline-fuel-oil problem and promised relief for civilians "in the very near future."

In the same column, lower down, appears in black-face type the following caption, "Gas ban to continue for duration—Ickes." Then this statement:

Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes said today that the ban on nonessential use of gasoline in the Eastern States probably will last for the duration and warned that the time will come when stricter gasoline controls will be imposed on the Midwest.

When an administration cannot bring order out of confusion which exists here

as to its domestic policy, is there any chance, anything to be gained, by now planning for the solution of all post-war problems?

Let us at least get out of bed before we start the day's work. This administration would undertake to solve world post-war problems, while it cannot here at home even start in an orderly manner the task of solving the immediate problems which face us.

Here we have the ridiculous situation of one high administrative official telling us one thing, another gives us a contradictory statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under Secretary Patterson says that production of war materials has fallen off 5 percent, and Mr. Nelson says that was wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And which is right? Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We do not know; we do not know what to believe.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can you know when you get statements of that kind from the heads of the departments?

Then here is another one. On page 11 of the same paper again in bold, black-face type extended across two columns are these words:

Food officials say housewife was "sucker" in Office of Price Administration roll-back.

Below it we find the following paragraph:

War Food Administration officials yesterday blamed Office of Price Administration theorists for financial losses, often severe, suffered the last few days by most producers, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers of meat and butter under the Government-ordered roll-back of prices.

Declaring that there was no way to estimate how large the over-all losses of the meat and dairy industries would be but admitting that in many instances they probably would be quite large, the War Food Administration officials who requested their names be omitted from any story, said that in many cases the housewife was made the "sucker" in the deal.

Here again we have two departments in this wonderful administration which we are told must not be touched by criticism—you would have us adopt the slavish idolatrous attitude of worshipping at the feet of the New Deal—and yet one comes along, one administrative agency comes along, it is perfect, and it tells us that another perfect branch of the administration is to blame because the handlers of meat and butter have sustained losses, some of them very severe, and that we are confused because of the actions of the second Government agency. Why, the whole administration is shot through and through with incompetency, waste, extravagance, and worse.

And then we have what? We have the coal strike. Why, why is the coal strike with us? Because this administration has lacked either the courage or the inclination—and you can take your pick—to establish a fair firm labor policy. More than 3 years ago from the Well of this House on a somewhat similar occasion I asked: "Who is the big boss,

John L. Lewis or President Roosevelt?" And to this day, to this day, the people do not know, or if they have an opinion all too many of them are of the opinion that the real boss is John L. Lewis, for so far Lewis has had his way and he has had his way why? He has had his way because this administration from the very beginning has been engaged in and has carried on a political alliance with organized labor leaders and labor politicians, sacrificing time and time again the good of the people in order to obtain the vote of those labor organizations, and that in spite of the fact that the last elections demonstrated beyond any question that those labor leaders did not speak for the rank and file of labor, for if they had many a man who is here today would not be in this House.

This coal strike is with us again today; doubtless it will be called off and again postponed by John L. Lewis before midnight tonight, because the President has been playing politics. But it will be back again if Lewis does not have his way.

If any of those who opposed war prior to Pearl Harbor were to interfere with production of munitions of war as have some of our labor leaders who have instigated strikes, he would have been behind the bars long ago.

On page 1 of this same Times-Herald, under today's date, June 22, in large type extending across the front page are these words:

Franklin D. Roosevelt orders end of Detroit riots; 23 dead.

Down below, but still in large type, is the caption:

United States troops moved to city in emergency. Hundreds arrested; 600 are injured.

Then follows the statement:

President Roosevelt early today ordered all persons engaged in "unlawful and insurrectionary" rioting in Detroit to return to their homes immediately.

The White House statement read:

I do hereby command all persons engaged in unlawful and insurrectionary proceedings to disperse and retire peaceably to their respective abodes immediately and hereafter abandon said combinations and submit themselves to the laws and the constituted authorities of said State (Michigan).

The President did the right thing when he called out the Federal troops to quell the rioting, the killing in the city of Detroit. A Federal statute which has often been quoted by me from the well of the house, gives him that authority, makes that procedure his duty, but oh, how different was the situation in the city of Flint and later in the city of Detroit and other Michigan cities back in 1937.

Yesterday, acting upon the request of the Governor of Michigan, the President, as was his duty, called out the Federal troops to protect the lives of Negroes and of whites. But back in 1937 when armed goon-squads, acting under the orders of his then political ally, John L. Lewis, who now defies him, marched into the city of Flint, took over the factories of that city, denied the use of public streets to citizens of our State, there was no action

from him. The then Governor of the State, Frank Murphy, who now sits in the Supreme Court, who if he goes in the front door walks in under the legend carved in marble "Equal justice under law," called out the National Guard of the State to protect the lawless seizers of private property from police of the city of Flint, to protect them from the sheriff and the sheriff's deputies of the county of Genesee.

Governor Murphy had been called back from the Philippine Islands by the President to run as a candidate for Governor of Michigan; with the aid of the President he was elected and when rioting, lawlessness, the defiance of the courts of the State were instigated by the President's then political ally, John L. Lewis, Governor Murphy, later rewarded by the President by appointment to the Supreme Court, aided the strikers in defying the law and in defeating the efforts of the law officers of the State to end rioting, violence, and lawlessness.

Where, oh where was President Roosevelt then? He was in the White House; and, according to Governor Murphy, he was in daily communication with the President. On that occasion when insurrection prevailed in the city of Flint for 6 months, F. D. R. ignored the Federal statute which required him to protect citizens. He then sat in the White House as silent as a graveyard, his lips as tightly sealed as those of the shell of a clam. When a word from him would have ended the lawlessness and the violence carried on by his political ally, he was as dumb as an oyster.

Thank God that once, at least once, whatever his motive, the President of the United States did the right thing by calling upon the Federal troops to suppress race riots. But do not be deceived, these riots in Detroit are not the result of Nazi or any other foreign propaganda unless it be the propaganda of Communists who have long stirred up race feeling.

This administration, if it wants to fix the responsibility for the Detroit and other race rioting need only to search its own household. There has been race feeling in Detroit for more than 2 years. This administration sought to cause an intermingling of races—knowing as it should have known that that effort would bring trouble. When the administration back in '37 deliberately gave aid to the wrecking crews of Lewis, it sowed the seed which it has ever since cultivated and kept watered—the seed of class feeling, which has grown and blossomed into riots between the white men who wanted to work, and the white picket lines which were determined that men should not work until they paid tribute and into riots between white men and colored men.

Right here in Washington month after month this administration has been planting the seeds of discord between the races. This administration has followed a policy which required whites and colored to intermingle in eating places, in lavatories, in public conveyances, and elsewhere regardless of the wishes of the individual. Now no one has more respect for the colored man than have I. I was brought up in the little town of Con-

stantine, St. Joseph County, Mich. My grandfather's farm, a farm which I today own, and which he reclaimed from virgin timber, is in Porter Township, Cass County, Mich. In that county prior to and during the Civil War was one end of a branch of the underground railway over which slaves from the South, on their way to Canada, traveled and where many of them stopped off and, ending their journey, made their permanent homes. Those colored men, when they left the South were slaves, when they reached Michigan they were free men; they were given homes.

They worked, they saved their money, they became landowners, they became businessmen; they became merchants and producers of merchandise. Yes, they were respected; they were honored in their communities; they became part of the community; they held local office; they took part in public discussions and were considered and were treated for what they were, loyal and patriotic, God-fearing, industrious, thrifty, American citizens.

There was no discrimination because of color or of birth, but there was no intermarriage; there was no attempt by the whites to invade the domestic, the home life of Negroes, and the Negroes made no attempt to interfere with the home life of the whites. Each was equal and to all was given equal justice under law. That is true to this day in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, except in one or two spots adjacent to Chicago and which have been reached by the New Deal teachings and by the writings of Eleanor Roosevelt.

It is only in those cities, in those localities where the Communists, with their antireligious doctrine, where the New Deal, with its so-called social planning, has interfered and brought discord and antirace feeling that we have or will have trouble.

We have this race rioting now because of the encouragement given by those who are stirring up race feeling and who have been stirring up race feeling for, lo, these many months given, I say, by people high in the favor of this administration. The President's wife herself could do a great deal to end this racial feeling which is sweeping the country, which is causing these race riots, which has caused the death of 23 men in Detroit within the last 48 hours; she could do a great deal to stop that if she would go home and attend to her housework, quit her silly, foolish talk, and end activities which, whatever may be her intent, give encouragement to others who bring about these riots.

Notwithstanding the shortage of transportation, the First Lady, though she has a beautiful, comfortable home in Hyde Park, one in the Executive Mansion here in Washington, goes up and down the countryside contributing nothing at all to the war effort by setting an example of needless, useless travel which can have no good effect upon the average citizen. Typical of many communications received by me is the one which came in on Monday, the 21st, from a resident of the District, and which reads, in part, as follows:



Just why can this woman chase all over and the taxpayers have to stay at home. My wife is ill, and I wanted to send her to Florida. Could afford it, but I couldn't get reservations. In fact, was denied the right to send her last early spring. She is worth a dozen like the wife of the President.

Hundreds of thousands of our people have somewhat similar thoughts. They would like to see the Hopkinses, the President's wife, and some others who are hot for war get down and contribute something aside from words, toward the war effort.

Let me say again to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] that, brought up as I was, associating as I did from my early boyhood days with Negroes, hunting and fishing and engaging in high-school sports with them, I learned to respect the Negroes and never have I lost that respect, but today I have no use for the man or the woman who teaches the Negro communism, who attempts to use him for political purposes, who, under the guise of helping him, creates a race feeling, brings about rioting in which always the Negro gets the worst of it.

As we all know the situation here in Washington is tense. Whites and blacks who are patriotic should join together to see that those who are taking advantage of the war to create race feeling, end their activities. Let the Negroes here in Washington have equality of opportunity. Had I my way, notwithstanding my firm conviction that we must practice economy, I would vote for the expenditure of millions, yes, billions of dollars to give the Negroes of Washington the best section of the city for residential and business and additional purposes and then I would say to the whites, give them equal justice but stay out of their section except as you are invited and to the Negroes I would say you follow the like procedure. We will transact business, we will get along in governmental affairs, you shall have equal opportunity; but we will follow nature's law, which good Negroes and good whites desire to follow. There will be no intermarriages. There will be no crowding and there will be no pushing and to those whites and to those Negroes who want to intermarry, who want to mingle the blood, whether they be man or woman, whether they be private citizens or members of the President's official family, I would say, do not attempt to run counter to the laws of nature, do not attempt to create another race, which will be neither black, white, nor yellow.

I would say to the agitators on both sides that they should not attempt to exploit their own races for political advantage. That is one thing that is wrong, that is one cause of the trouble. It is idle, I believe, for northern Republicans and northern Democrats if you want to put it that way, to come in here with their anti-lynching bills, their anti-poll-tax bill when we have occurrences like we had in Detroit, a blot on the fair name of our city and State. Due to what? Due to the seeds that were sown there by John L. Lewis, seeds sown then and watered by this administration when they let the violence go on for 6 months in 1937, a violence which smoldered underground, as

evidenced from time to time by strikes in our factories. When men of the Negro race were elevated or demoted that feeling was stirred up, and has continued all the time. Law and order were set aside and strikes continued. Why? All to obtain political advantage.

Let me conclude by saying that I hold no brief for Tom Dewey. I care not whether he or some other man is nominated as the candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency. I only voice one thought in that connection, and that is I hope that the Charlie McCarthy of your party, Wendell Willkie, never appears on our ticket again.

Let me end with the statement that unless this administration quits playing politics, unless it makes the defeat of our enemies its chief objective, unless it ends the confusion and the chaos, the destructive policy which it is pursuing here on the home front, this war will be prolonged and the war's end will find the Republic as we know it—destroyed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 1 day, on account of official business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238);

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); and

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 23, and Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, June 23, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, Old House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

##### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

514. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

##### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 270. Resolution for the considera-

tion of H. R. 2869, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 573. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 574. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 575. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 576. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3018. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3021. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3022. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3023. A bill to promote farm ownership by providing for Government-insured loans to veterans to enable them to become owners of farm homes through long-term, low-interest-rate loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3024. A bill to secure to the producers of agricultural commodities a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3025. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus Army materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARNES of Indiana:

H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3027. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works—namely, im-

provement of the channel in the St. Johns River from Palatka to Lake Harney, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3028. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3029. A bill to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 237, "Questions and Answers Containing an Analysis Relative to the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943"; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1692. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, calling upon the proper authorities to maintain in full force and effect all measures available for the duration of the war, to the end that no person of Japanese race shall be permitted to enter upon or remain in the Pacific coast area from which persons of Japanese race have been excluded by orders now in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1693. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the members of the Shields Farm Bureau Advisory Council, Morgan County, Ohio, opposing farm price roll-back and subsidy payment on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1694. By Mr. HOPE: Petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. Also, petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. Also, petition urging support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1697. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 110 citizens of Polk County, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1698. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1699. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the New York State Hotel Association, requesting that after all of the gasoline requirements of the armed forces of the United States have been met, such gasoline as is available or allotted for civilian use should be allotted on a parity basis in such fashion as to secure that the citizens of all States should have an equal share; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1700. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Clara Sylvester Emery, of Rockland, and 230 other citizens of Knox County, Maine, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1701. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of Townsend Club No. 1, of Cassadaga, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1702. Also, petition of the New York State Automobile Association, Albany, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale, distribution, and use of gasoline in the Eastern Seaboard States; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, once more a new day with its golden hours lies before us. We are grateful for a laboring place in Thy vineyard and that in work that keeps faith sweet and strong Thou callest us to be fellow laborers with Thee.

In the midst of crushing cares and frenzied fears may the healing balm of Thy presence restore our jaded souls. Forgive the petulance of our impatience, which is revealed in our discouragements, in our hasty judgments, in our childish outbursts, because the kingdom of love and justice and peace seems so long delayed. Forgive the impertinence that would hurry on the dawn, that would thrust impious hands across the pattern Thou art weaving, that would outrun Thy perfect will for us. Strengthen us to play our part in the life of our times, to think clearly, to speak kindly, to act bravely, to walk in the light as Thou art in the light, to keep the faith, to finish our course and, falling on sleep, to gain the crown—the approval of the Master of all good workmen. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 22, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for